

# THE CHRISTIAN REVIEW.

No. XIX.

---

SEPTEMBER, 1840.

---

## ARTICLE I.

### BIBLICAL INTERPRETATION.

#### INTERPRETATION OF FIGURATIVE LANGUAGE, OF MAXIMS, ALLEGORIES AND PARABLES.

THE Bible abounds in figurative language. Figures are employed in the Scriptures, not for the sake of ornament, so much as being, particularly among Orientals, the natural expression of clear views and deep feeling, and as adapted to produce impression. They ought not to be understood literally; and great care should be exercised in explaining figurative language, not to confound figures with one another, nor with plain language. The precise point, also, which the writer or speaker had in view should be ascertained, and the figurative language should be explained with reference to that point. Other meanings, besides the one manifestly intended, should not be attached to the language. It is no part of an interpreter's office to show in how many possible, or plausible, ways, the language of a writer may be explained; but, to explain what was the precise intention of the writer. Having furnished such an explanation, he ought to be satisfied. All explanation that lies beyond that limit, may be put to the account of human ingenuity, rather than to the proper intent of the true sayings of God.

Such an undue extension of figurative language is certainly in one extreme; there is another, which is, to say the least, no less unreasonable and far more hurtful; namely, the conclusion that because certain language is figurative, it therefore means nothing. Sometimes the edge of scriptural language concerning the world of future wo is entirely turned by the convenient remark, that it is only figurative language. But is it therefore destitute of meaning? Because figures drawn from the present world must, of necessity, be employed in conveying to our minds information respecting the future state, does it therefore follow that the instruction which is imparted contains no reality? Who ever thought so, respecting figurative language on any other subject? On the contrary, figurative language is often resorted to as the spontaneous expression of a conviction and an emotion too deep to be communicated in the comparatively lifeless forms of literal language.

On the same principle we ought to explain the maxims, or proverbial sayings, which occur in the Bible. That is, in endeavoring to understand them, we should seek for the precise point for illustrating or enforcing which they were introduced. They must not be subjected to our imagination, so much as to our judgment. The connection in which they occur will generally show for what purpose they were employed; whether as illustrating or enforcing some thought, or accounting for some conduct. Having ascertained the precise point for which they were used, and discovered how they were applicable to that point, we should not push our inquiries further. As instances of such maxims, or common sayings, see Matt. 19: 24, 30. 20: 16. 22: 14. Luke 4: 24. Similitudes, also, are to be explained in the same manner. See Matt. 9: 16, 17. It is highly advantageous, in order to understand such proverbial sayings and similitudes, to consider for what intent and within what limits similar expressions are employed in common life. We should conceive of ourselves as in the company originally addressed, and inquire how we should have been expected by the speaker to understand his remarks. Nothing is more usual than that common sayings are not intended to be literally understood; nor are they to be taken in all the fulness of meaning which might possibly be drawn from them; nor are they to be explained aside from the precise connection in



which they are employed. We should do injustice to a friend by understanding a proverbial saying, or apophthegm, employed by him on a certain occasion, in all its possible meanings, or in other meanings than the very one which his own mind intended it to convey in that particular connection. We do a similar injustice to the conversations or discourses, recorded in the Bible, if we explain maxims and similitudes there employed, as having another, or a more copious sense, in any given passage, than that which was intended by the original speaker. Regard must be had to the connection, the circumstances, and the particular point which was to be illustrated or enforced. The feelings and usages of common life must also be taken into account. It is necessary, too, to remember that such sayings are capable of various applications and have different shades of meaning in different connections, being introduced to illustrate different points. Compare Matt. 20: 16, with 22: 14. See also John 4: 37.

A similar direction may be given in respect to allegorical passages. An allegory is a metaphor spread out extensively. It is then to be explained in the same manner essentially as is a simple metaphor. In other words, an allegorical passage is to be explained, *as a whole*, in subserviency to its main design. Let that design be discovered, and in the interpretation let every thing foreign, or aside from it, be avoided. The eightieth psalm contains a beautiful allegory. Under the image of a vine which had been transplanted in a genial soil, had greatly flourished and spread its boughs far and wide, but which had afterwards been neglected by the proprietor, and subjected to violent treatment, the various changes of the Hebrew nation are represented. In explaining this allegory, we ought to select the particular quality, or qualities, of a vine appropriate to the writer's design. To dwell upon other qualities of a vine, would embarrass the subject, and lead away the mind from the intention of the psalmist: it would, indeed, be puerile trifling, showing rather the fancy of the expounder than benefiting the understanding and the heart of a reader or hearer. Nor would it be judicious, or even right, to enter minutely into explanations of the other objects introduced into this allegorical passage; for instance, the boar out of the wilderness. What propriety is there, in inquiring, why the

enemies of Israel were represented by a boar; and by a boar coming out of a wilderness? Let common sense, enlightened by knowledge of manners and customs, and by general information, guide in explaining the metaphors and allegories of Scripture, and they would come to the hearts, and commend themselves to the understandings, of all men. They would cease to be regarded as mere collections of words, which may lawfully be tortured into every variety of shape, as the whim of any one's ungoverned imagination may suggest.

We come now to the parables. These are supposed cases, or representations, introduced in order to illustrate or enforce some topic. It is, then, with reference to that particular topic for which it was introduced, that a parable must be interpreted. The connection, consequently, in which a parable is introduced, is of great importance, as showing for what purpose it was spoken and, therefore, with reference to what point it must be interpreted. Thus the parable of Jotham in the book of Judges (9: 8—15) was devised to illustrate the folly of the Israelites in selecting Abimelech for their ruler. The parable of the good Samaritan (Luke 10: 30—37) was designed as a reply to the question, Who is my neighbor? and viewed with reference to this question, it has great force and beauty, as well as aptitude. The parable of the prodigal son (Luke 15: 11—32) was intended to vindicate the Saviour's conduct in associating with those whom the Pharisees contemptuously styled publicans and sinners; and regarded with reference to this purpose, it is evidently an appeal to the Pharisees' hearts which their consciences could scarcely have permitted them to resist.

The first thing, then, and indeed almost the only thing, to be sought for in the explanation of a parable, is, the point for the illustration or enforcement of which it was spoken. This being ascertained, let the parable be explained, not as containing every thing which an inventive imagination, viewing it as an inexhaustible storehouse of religious instruction, might draw from it, but as having reference to that particular point. Let the various portions of the parable be regarded, not as so many separate sources of instruction, but as parts of one whole, as all contributing to form the dress in which instruction on the particular topic presented shall be conveyed. For instance;

it would lead the mind entirely aside from the purpose of the parable of the good Samaritan, to inquire, What do the thieves represent? What does the Samaritan's beast represent? What do the two pence mean? What is represented by the inn? &c., &c. Instead of being directed to the real design of the parable, and drawing from it the instruction which the Saviour intended to communicate, the mind would thus become occupied with irrelevant topics, and would really lose the benefit of the parable, however much it might be flattering itself that it was digging deep into an exhaustless mine of spiritual instruction.

The propriety of the view here taken of parables, may be shown by the usages of common life. Suppose we had lived at the time these parables were spoken, and were the very individuals addressed. Or, suppose the speaker to be now on earth in the midst of us, and to be holding conversation with us, or to be speaking in our assemblies. We should understand him according to the ordinary principles of conversation and speaking; just as we understand one another. In familiar conversation, or in a more formal address, we sometimes invent a case, or make a supposition in the form of a narrative, in order to illustrate some point. Do we expect those with whom we are conversing, or whom we are addressing, to lose sight of the point about which we are speaking, and to be occupied with the mere dress, the drapery, of our representation? They may indeed be delighted with the language in which we present the supposed case; they may be attracted to a more fixed attention by the aptness and beauty of our imagery. But these are only secondary effects; the fixing of their attention and the exciting of their delight are only subsidiary to the ultimate object of gaining the assent of their understandings and hearts to the views which we desire to enforce.

The inquiry may here be suggested, whether the design of each parable in the Scriptures is distinctly stated, or can be certainly discovered from the connection in which it stands? This inquiry must be answered in the negative. In respect, then, to such parables as are not furnished with an unquestionable clue to the design for which they were spoken, we are left, more or less, to conjecture.

Sometimes, the moral or religious lesson conveyed is sufficiently manifest in the parable itself, or from the general circumstances of the Jews in the time of our Lord, or from some statements in the vicinity of the parable; and sometimes a parable, wholly unaccompanied by any hint as to the occasion on which it was spoken, may very happily fit some conversation, or some event, recorded in another part of the Gospel in which it occurs, or even in another of the Gospels. In such cases, sound sense and nice discrimination are peculiarly requisite in an interpreter; and probability is the utmost that the nature of the case will allow us to attain. But though we may not be able to assign a particular parable to the event, or conversation, which called it forth, we may yet be able to perceive, without doubt, the precise point of instruction, which it was intended to convey.

But is no instruction, it may be asked, to be derived from a parable besides that which concerns the precise point to be illustrated? In reply, it may be observed, that on whatever subject we are reading or speaking, there will often be communicated some subsidiary and incidental information. But, in the connection in which that information occurs, it is regarded not as principal, but as merely subsidiary to the main purpose; the mind does not rest on it as the grand object. This instruction, therefore, while it stands in a given connection, is not to be explained by itself, but as being part of a certain whole. Yet these subsidiary or incidental views may be highly important, when considered apart and by themselves; and the particular instruction contained in them, may be made the principal instruction in another connection and when another purpose is to be served. For instance; the parable of the prodigal son was designed to vindicate the Saviour for associating with publicans and sinners. The amount of the vindication is this: "I proceed, in this conduct, upon the same principles by which a father would receive to his embrace a prodigal son who should return with penitence to filial duty and to the paternal roof; and you, in objecting to my conduct, resemble another son of this father who should be so destitute of filial and fraternal affection, as to feel no delight in the return of his brother, and even to be angry at his father's joyfully receiving the penitent, returning son." But



instead of employing this cold, abstract manner of stating the principle involved in his conduct and in theirs, he draws a heart-affecting picture of a disobedient son reducing himself to the last extremity of wretchedness, but at length brought to feel the claims of duty, returning in humility and good earnest to his father, making appropriate confessions, and supplicating parental pity and forgiveness. He presents to our view the father running, with all the tenderness of a father's heart, to meet the child's return, and in the most convincing manner assuring the broken-hearted prodigal of a welcome reception. He then presents to us an elder son, making cold and heartless inquiries, becoming angry at the father's demonstrations of joy, and needing to have his father expostulate with him.

Now, while this parable so triumphantly vindicates the Saviour's conduct, it also furnishes an affecting *spectacle of a true penitent*. But this specimen of true repentance was subsidiary to his main design, and should not be regarded as the leading object of the parable. It may, however, be separated from the whole parable and be regarded as, in itself, unfolding the views and feelings of a penitent towards God. Yet, when read in the connection in which it occurs, and as only a part of the parable, it should not be explained by itself, as though it exhibited the chief design of the Saviour. It was only subsidiary to his main design, which was to show the propriety of his associating with publicans and sinners who had been reclaimed from the error of their ways, or who, at least, felt such an interest in his instructions as to be promising objects of his attention.

There is a general caution which it may be well to bear in mind respecting the interpretation of parables; namely, we ought not to deduce from them doctrines which are aside from, or additional to, their real design. A doctrine thus deduced may be true, and may be amply sustained by the Scriptures. But, unless it is obviously recognized in a given parable, we should not feel at liberty to use that parable in defending it. If the object of the parable can be distinctly perceived, let us adhere to that object, and not add to the parable another, even though it may be a connected, object. Take, for illustration, the parable of the growing plant (Mark 4: 26—29); the parable of the

mustard seed (Matt. 13: 31, 32); and that of the leaven (Matt. 13: 33). These were designed to show the extension of the Messiah's cause and its ultimate triumph. Let us not employ them as teaching the certain ultimate sanctification of *each believer* and his perseverance in grace unto eternal life. Because, these parables would hold good in the view for which the Saviour presented them, *even though* it were not true that each real saint will be kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation. The Messiah's kingdom might, in general, be a spreading kingdom destined to ultimate victory, even though some particular Christian should fail of attaining its blessings in heaven.

R.

---

ARTICLE II.

## JUDAS ISCARIOT, ONE OF THE TWELVE DISCIPLES.

THE history of our Saviour's intercourse with Judas Iscariot, as given in the New Testament, presents some interesting and remarkable facts; and in these facts some solemn and affecting instructions and warnings. The present article is devoted to the statement and use of these.

Christ did unquestionably call Judas Iscariot, among others, to be with him, as a disciple, Mark 3: 13—19. "And he goeth up into a mountain and calleth unto him whom he would and they came unto him; and he ordained twelve that they might be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach, and to have power to heal sicknesses and to cast out devils." Following this passage, are given by Mark the names of these "twelve," among which we find that of Judas Iscariot. He unquestionably, therefore, belonged to the first company of chosen disciples of Christ; was admitted into their company by the Saviour himself. From the Gospel of Luke (6: 12) it also appears that previous to calling these twelve, and Judas among them, our Saviour spent a whole night in prayer to the Father. From Luke's Gospel it

also appears probable that Judas was present when Christ "lifted up his eyes on his disciples" and pronounced the benedictions recorded in chapter 6, verses 20 to 23.

This man was employed by Christ as a member of the company of twelve, in teaching and working miracles. Thus writes Luke, 9: 1, *et seq.*, "Then he called his twelve disciples together and gave them power and authority over all devils, and to cure diseases, and he sent them to preach the kingdom of God and to heal the sick, &c., and they departed and went through the towns, preaching the gospel and healing, every where." Nothing appears but that Judas shared in this authority, miraculous power, and work of preaching, equally with the other eleven. Nor does there appear to have been any distrust of him, at this time, by the other disciples.

Our Saviour committed to Judas a particular trust, additional to the general one he gave him in common with the other eleven; that of treasurer. John 12: 6, "He had the bag (or purse), and bore what was put therein." Confirmation of this fact appears in that, when our Saviour said to him, in connection with giving him the sop, "that thou doest do quickly," "some of them thought that Jesus had said to him, buy those things that we have need of against the feast; or that he should give something to the poor."

All this time, however, as it subsequently appears, our Saviour perfectly understood the character of Judas; and this fact, of course, is inferable from the divine omniscience of Christ. John 6: 64, "Jesus knew, from the beginning, who they were that believed not, and who should betray him." Long before his death, he said to the twelve, on one occasion (John 6: 70, 71), "Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil? He spake of Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon, for he it was that should betray him, being one of the twelve." And while they were together on the evening of the passover, and after Christ had washed the feet of the disciples, he said (John 13: 10, 11), "And ye are clean, but not all; for he knew who should betray him; therefore, said he, ye are not all clean."

Jesus Christ permitted this man to have the same external privileges with the other disciples. During three whole years of his own public ministry, he allowed Judas

to be with him and the eleven others, to listen to his instructions, to witness his miracles, to behold the excellence of his example and the glory of his character. At the paschal supper he was allowed to eat and drink with the Saviour and the eleven. His feet, with those of the others, were washed by the condescending Saviour.

Jesus Christ showed most remarkable forbearance to Judas uniformly, down to the time of his own betrayal by him. "Six days before the passover," our Saviour, with his disciples, was at the house of Martha, Mary and Lazarus; at which time (John 12: 3) "Mary took a pound of ointment of spikenard, very costly, and anointed the feet of Jesus,—and the house was filled with the odor of the ointment." Judas said, "Why was not this ointment sold for three hundred pence and given to the poor? This he said, not that he cared for the poor, but because he was a thief and had the bag, and bare what was put therein." The only notice which Christ took of this speech of the traitor was, "Let her alone; against the day of my burying hath she kept this; for the poor always ye have with you; but me ye have not always." A word from Christ would have disclosed, upon the spot, the hypocrisy and thievish disposition of the man. But the Saviour allowed him to pass without any thing said, applicable to him more than to the rest, to those who were his friends.

As the time of this man's consummation of his wickedness drew near, our Saviour did speak in most impressive language, in the presence of Judas, of his real character, and of the disclosures he would make of himself. This was done, by Christ, in a manner adapted to arouse the conscience of Judas, while yet he made no exposure of him, personally. After having said to the twelve, respecting his instructions (John 13: 17), "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them," he immediately adds, "I speak not of you all; I know whom I have chosen," meaning who were his true disciples; and then refers to the prophecy, about to be fulfilled, "He that eateth bread with me, hath lifted up his heel against me." And there sat the guilty man in whom that Scripture was to be fulfilled. Still, there appears nothing denunciatory or accusative in the Saviour's treatment of Judas, at this time. He simply announced the fact. A few moments passed, and after some further instructions given by



Christ, again, it is written, "Jesus was troubled in spirit; and testified and said, Verily, verily, I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me." And still he forbears from a personal application to Judas, of that which was so solemnly true. His words were as applicable to any one of the twelve as to another; "*one of you* shall betray me." And his language had this effect, that the disciples "looked one on another, doubting of whom he spoke." He continues to spare Judas the pain and disgrace of an exposure; and for wise and salutary purposes, lets the premonition take effect upon the eleven true disciples; so that "they began every one of them to say, Lord, is it I?" He does not relieve their solicitude and fear in the least, by telling them who it was; except that, privately to John, who was next him and inquired, "Lord, who is it?" he said, "He it is to whom I shall give a sop, when I have dipped it." When he had done this, John was the only disciple who knew the meaning of it. And when, at last, Christ said to Judas, in relation to his execution of his perfidious design, "That thou doest, do quickly," "no man at the table knew for what intent he spake this unto him," John excepted, to whom the Saviour had just given the intimation.

The Saviour, it appears, had now given to Judas the fearful intimation that all restraints on his actions were removed. It was as though he had said to him, "You have played the hypocrite till you have provoked the divine abandonment of you to yourself and to ruin; now do your worst;" not a permission or direction to sin; but a prediction of the awful certainty that he would sin, to the disgrace of his profession, the blasting of his name to all generations, and the destruction of his own soul.

This was followed, as the reader will recollect, by the immediate departure of Judas from the company, to go to the chief priests; the institution of the sacrament of the Supper, and our Saviour's administration of it to the eleven faithful disciples; his counsels to them, which compose the remainder of the 13th with the 14th, 15th and 16th chapters of John; Christ's intercessory prayer with and for his disciples, which is the 17th chapter; his departure with the disciples to the garden of Gethsemane, and his prayers, and agonies of soul there. During this time, Judas was transacting with the chief

priests for the betrayal of his Lord. "Having received a band of men and officers from the chief priests and Pharisees" (John 18: 3), he comes to that garden "with lanterns and torches and weapons."

Now comes on the last interview of our Saviour with Judas Iscariot. The traitor had given the band of men and officers "a sign, saying, Whomsoever I shall kiss, that same is he, take him" (Matthew, "hold him fast"), "and lead him away safely. And as soon as he was come, he drew near unto Jesus to kiss him," "and saith, Hail, Master, and kissed him." Here should be noticed the Saviour's patient endurance of this man's perfidy, at each step. He only says to him, now, "Judas, betrayest thou the Son of man with a kiss?" "Friend, wherefore art thou come?"—a recognition of acquaintanceship, not an expression of complacency in his character. It was as if he had said, "I know who thou art?" Even in these fearful moments, and while Judas was completing the climax of his wickedness, there was nothing in the Saviour accusative, condemnatory, and of the character of resistance. And yet that which he said was solemn as the words of God. He was suffering betrayal at the hands of a professed disciple; and entering upon the woes of that hour of the triumph of his enemies and of the powers of darkness. He was suffering himself to be "led as a lamb to the slaughter;" and, with the exception of his words just recited, silent. But to "Judas Iscariot," would he but have considered it, what an eloquent and awful silence!

Here ended the intercourse between the Lord Jesus Christ and "that man by whom he was betrayed." The reader knows the end of the betrayer. Some of the instructions to be derived from this history, will be briefly sketched.

Not all who are admitted to the visible society of Christians, are Christians, in truth. In the church first formed after the coming of Christ into the world,—a church formed by the Saviour himself; a small church, select; there was one hypocrite and heir of perdition. This is a mystery in the church of Christ, appearing under his own personal administration; and not all the vigilance and care of those who have kept the doors of the church, from that time to the present, have prevented the occur-

rence of like cases. Why this is permitted by the Head of the church, we cannot tell fully. One reason, however, doubtless is, that upon this fact may be rested appeals to the godly fear and self-jealousy of all who make a visible profession of religion. It is hardly probable that there is a church upon the face of the earth without some false professors in it.

The Lord Jesus Christ, in his infinite wisdom, can make use even of those in the church who are not his true friends, for the accomplishment of his own purposes. This he can do in entire consistency with their remaining as they are, and perishing at last in an aggravated destruction. God often employs men in connection with his church, and in carrying forward the concerns of his kingdom, who have never "known the grace of God in truth," and will never reach heaven themselves. Judas Iscariot, during his life as a disciple of Christ, doubtless answered some important purposes for Christ. And now, as an example, a warning against trifling with God in a false profession, his history is full of instruction. Some purposes are doubtless being accomplished through his history, which could have been accomplished in no other way.

Christ, as the searcher of hearts, perfectly understands the character of all who enter the visible church; and who hold stations in it, official or private. He "needed not (on earth) that any should testify of man; for he knew what was in man." "I the Lord search the heart, I try the reins of the children of men," is his declaration of his power to discern character. Every one who makes a Christian profession, therefore, may well lift his eyes to him with holy trembling, while he acknowledges, "For thou, Lord, knowest me altogether." There is no question which a professor of the religion of Christ can ask himself, which is possessed of deeper solemnity than this, "What am I in the sight of Christ? What does he know me to be, friend or enemy? Child of his love or alien? Saint, or sinner condemned already?"

The possession of high privileges, under the permission of Providence, and in the visible church, is no sure indication of divine complacency, nor of right character. Judas Iscariot, with all his privileges, was still "the traitor." Thus in the church, still, some enter, bear the name and enjoy the reputation of Christians, come to ordinances, and talk of their hopes of heaven; in whom,

under the divine inspection, remain the unaltered evidences of alienation from God. Some worldly interest may be subserved, for a time, by a place within the pale of the church. Judas found his temporary interest in association with Christ and his eleven true disciples. But what thought he of this, in that terrible hour when awakened to the terrors of his condition as having "betrayed the innocent blood." The unconverted now in the church, perhaps in the sacred office, moves on in quietness and self-complacency at present; but the disclosing hour of a fatal plunge into sin, or if that come not, the hour of death; or if that even find him in the quietness attendant on a seared conscience, the day of judgment, and the revolving ages of eternity,—in what condition of feelings will these find him?

The forbearance of Christ with those who are in his church but out of his favor, is mercy in close and fearful association with justice. He permits the false professor to live many years in the church and in the reputableness of a profession; throws around him restraints, so that he perhaps does not, for years, forfeit his standing, by anything scandalous and palpable, as against his Christian character. His hour is not yet come, is long, perhaps, in coming. True wisdom teaches, that those who stand in doubt of themselves should diligently employ the season of forbearance, in self-searching, and making their foundation sure.

Unsound professors are not left without many forewarnings and much instruction, adapted to the purpose of manifesting them to themselves. The delineations of true religion in the Scriptures; the examples of genuine gracious character which they are permitted to see; the rebukes of conscience; the warnings of the word against self-deception; the sad declensions of many, the fall of some; the utter and final apostasy of others; all these are monitions for those who have a "name to live," while "dead." Continued self-deception or hypocrisy, and final failure of the salvation of the gospel, will be emphatically without excuse in the case of such. No men perish with their eyes more fully open to their duty and their dangers, and to the ruin they approach, than do unsound professors of the Christian faith.

The fact, that a false professor of religion is not certainly known to be such, by those around him, is no



evidence of his safety, so long as the eye of Christ may see him corrupt at heart. The belief of the man, in whom lurks an insidious disease, that he is in health, does not settle the point that he is so. Nor does the opinion of others that he is sound in health alter his condition. The disciples of Christ had such confidence, apparently, in Judas Iscariot, that he was not more an object of suspicion than others of the twelve. And yet their confidence did not make him a good man. The confidence of the whole church of God in one who has not true grace, cannot stay him from sinking down to hell, except he repent. The question, therefore, is not, Have I the charity of my brethren? but, Does the Lord, who "trieth the righteous," know me to be a Christian?

The condition of that man is, beyond all conception, awful, who has arrived at the point where the restraints are removed which have hitherto preserved him from apostasy and disgrace; and when he is left to the mighty workings of his own depravity. The situation of no condemned spirit in hell is more hopeless than his. Nor can it be predicted what shall be the limit of his race of wickedness; what he will not do, even on this side of the grave, to render him an abhorrence of God and man, and a terror to himself. On the other—but "O my soul, come not thou into their secret." Can mortal mind conceive, or tongue describe, the terrors which fill the soul of the hypocrite, when he has entered into the prison of eternal despair!

There will be a fearful contrast between the times of the silent sufferings of Christ and his cause in this world, at the hands of false and treacherous friends, and that hour when they will stand at the foot of the "great white throne." When the graceless bearer of the name of "Christian," having his hands stained with the blood of Christ, shall "stand before the judgment seat of Christ;" when the wounds he has inflicted upon the Saviour shall be counted and named; the sentence of injured justice be declared, and the sword of the divine indignation uplifted; what sickness of heart and shudderings of spirit will overwhelm him! And while even saints and angels may tremble to behold the pouring out of the vials of divine wrath upon him, well may they exclaim, "Good had it been for that man if he had never been born!"

## ARTICLE III.

## THIERSCH ON CLASSICAL EDUCATION.

*F. Thiersch on Classical Education, translated from the German by the Editor.\**

WERE the nations of classical antiquity entirely disconnected with us, had they no influence over us, or were their influence prejudicial to our interests, then it would be unwise to put their literary productions into the hands of the young. In that case, we should come to the same result, though in a different way, as the emperor Julian did, who excluded the classic writers from Christian schools, in order to exclude learning and influence from Christian society. But this whole view springs from an arbitrary distinction, and rests upon no better foundation than a plausible error. To what extent the works of the ancients are intelligible to us, and fitted to act upon our minds, may be learned from the fact that the productions of the oldest Greek bard, the Iliad and the Odyssey of Homer, notwithstanding their foreign air, are more popular, even among those who do not understand Greek, than any modern, or even German epic.

---

\* This eloquent defence of classical studies, like the whole work, "On Learned Schools," from which it is extracted, deserves the serious attention of all who take a special interest in the great subject of a learned education. That the distinguished author, in his enthusiasm for "those ancient immortals," and in his zeal for the cause of classical education, should carry some of his views to an extreme, will not be regarded as strange. We think he has done so in several instances, and particularly on page 346, where he maintains that one can learn the Latin and Greek languages simultaneously in the same time that would be requisite for the former alone. If he had only said that a thorough comprehension of Roman literature could be best and soonest attained by the study of both languages, or merely that the knowledge and discipline acquired in studying the Greek greatly facilitate the study of Latin, his statement would have appeared less paradoxical. It should be borne in mind that the author wrote for Germans, and that many of his allusions would be made unintelligible, if not ridiculous, by being applied to any other than the German system of academic study. We have omitted sentences and even whole paragraphs, where much commentary would be required to explain the text to an ordinary American reader, and in general, as the author's glowing style is peculiarly German, we have labored more to be true to the spirit than to the letter of the original. The first volume of Thiersch on Learned Schools appeared in four parts, in 1826; the second volume, in 1827; and the third, in 1837. His last work on the general subject relates to the Present State of Public Instruction in the Western States of Germany, in Holland, in France and in Belgium. The extract that is here presented is from Vol. I, Part IV, of the former work, and may be found in the first volume of Friedemann's *Pardnesen*.—ED.

Is Virgil to be laid aside and Tasso adopted, merely because the former portrays Grecian and Roman scenes, and the latter Christian and Arabian? I will say nothing of productions in prose; for it were absurd to maintain that the history of Switzerland by Von Müller, for example, is intelligible to us, but that Thucydides is unintelligible to Greek scholars; or that the speeches of Fox or Canning may be comprehended by us, but that the orations of Cicero or Demosthenes are incomprehensible and their beauties concealed. If a man of a vigorous and sound mind cannot attain to a true knowledge and just appreciation of the greatness and excellence of the immortal productions of the ancients, whence comes the honest admiration which has always been cherished for them, even in times less enlightened than ours, by the noblest spirits of our race? True, indeed, these relics of ancient genius have to us a foreign air; but this peculiarity relates to the form more than to the spirit, and it is as necessary to rise above that in the study of Cervantes as of Sophocles, of Dante as of Homer. Beneath this form, there is, in the best writers of antiquity, an almost divine simplicity, springing directly from the justness of their views and the truth of their pictures of real life.

The *foreign air* of classical literature, and the consequent *difficulty* of mastering its forms and imbibing its spirit, are sometimes urged as objections to making it the basis of education. But *these very difficulties*,—the mental activity and labor which it costs to overcome them,—furnish to learned schools the best means of intellectual discipline and culture. It is with the mind of the youth as it is with his body. "This," says an ancient writer, "cannot be trained in the *palaestra* by merely promenading its groves, and witnessing the exercises, the strength, the skill, the perseverance of others, nor by a mere study of the rules. The youth himself must struggle and contend, as well as others, must exercise himself in running, in leaping and throwing the discus and the spear, must oppose power to power, and skill to skill, must call forth and exert to the utmost every energy, and, by an unyielding determination to conquer, sustain his exhausted and sinking powers, that, by protracted struggles and hardships, he may develop his full strength, and thereby secure the victory which shall one day crown his efforts at Olympia." It is

equally true, that the mind cannot be strengthened and disciplined by being conducted through the field of literature, and entertained with its flowery attractions, as on an excursion of pleasure. Let a teacher try the experiment. Let a young man be taught, if he can be, to find pleasure in studying the Adventures of Telemachus or in Tasso, in the Andromache and Phœdra of the French, or the Clytemnestra and Merope of the Italian theatre; let him entertain himself with the history of Rollin, or the tales of Florian, or satiate his desires with the most elegant productions of our own literature. It will be but a passive process of education, an excitement of the fancy, an inactive surrender to a charm, perhaps an ecstasy, a mere admiration of the glowing images that have been presented. But, for the solid material of a scientific education, the discipline and *gymnastic* exercise of the mind, and consequent intellectual power, nothing will have been gained. On the contrary, there is in such a procedure great danger of quenching the natural pleasure of mental activity, and of destroying all intellectual energy. The inevitable result of such a training will be the raising up of a class of young men unaccustomed to hardship, impatient of earnest application, flippant in counsel, incapable of the serious responsibilities of life, unable to meet the demands of science, or to discharge the duties of official stations, competent, perhaps, to increase the amount of our sunken literature, and to sit in judgment on its shadowy images.

All instruction for the education of a young man must aim at the discipline of his entire spiritual nature; and the *gymnasium* must be for the *gymnastic* exercise of the mind, as it was anciently for that of the body. This demand is met in no way so effectually as by the *earnest, thorough, well-directed and well-sustained* study of the classic productions of ancient Greece and Rome. The very difficulties which the young mind has to overcome in mastering the wonderful inflections and constructions of the ancient languages call into action its undeveloped energies more than any other study. The intellectual struggles, which cannot be so great nor so protracted in the study of modern languages where, in order to an introduction to their entire literature, nothing but grammatical difficulties are to be contended with, must, in the



ancient languages, be repeated in each new department of literature, as in passing from the poets to the historians, to the philosophers and to the orators. Neither the sphere of views and representations which constitute the world of one of these classes of writers, nor the principles of art which lie at the foundation of their success, can be apprehended by the student and incorporated into his own system but by new acquisitions of knowledge and new struggles for intellectual greatness. From Homer there is no short road leading directly to Pindar or to the tragedians, none from Herodotus to Demosthenes. The works of each of these great men require specific attention, and none but the scholar who makes each of them successively his particular study can fully comprehend their spirit, or feel their power.

To the difficulties already mentioned must be added those of acquiring a thorough knowledge of the mythology, the antiquities, the history, laws and customs of the Greeks and Romans. All this compels the student to muster every power of his mind in seizing, combining and comprehending his materials, so that by extending his knowledge in every direction, by associating and properly adjusting what belongs together, by deducing from the known the unknown, he may be able to penetrate the sanctuary of genius, and become master of its perfection as though it were his own.

As such an exercise puts all the intellectual powers of the student in motion, and gives them greater expansion, it tends directly to improve the *judgment* and to form the *taste*. In a perfect model, ever fresh and glowing before him in spite of its antiquity, be it a strain of Homer or of Virgil, an oration of Demosthenes or of Cicero, a book of Thucydides or of Sallust, he sees, if all its parts have, with careful study, been duly inspected, the whole art of just arrangement and skilful execution distinctly exemplified. He will, under the guidance of a competent teacher, learn from one such great example how a subject ought to be treated, how arranged and divided, to what place each part should be assigned, with what it should be interwoven, what is to be adopted and what rejected, and how the inferior parts should be subordinated to the rest and the more important held up conspicuously to observation. Thus he learns to comprehend in the work of a master

the difficult art of invention, division, arrangement and combination, and is in a fair way to be able himself to practise the art.\* Besides this internal economy, which is the soul and spirit of a production, the student will learn to appreciate and ultimately acquire the exterior excellences of representation, itself the token of a good training. He will discover the secret of a right distribution of the members of a sentence, the mutual relation of its parts, the harmonious play of its rising and falling undulations, its variety of detail and general equipoise, all of which is thrown around the idea like graceful drapery. In poetical works the incomparable perfection of the rhythmical and musical form awakens first a sensibility to its charm, and then creates a taste for harmonious and just representation. The mind thus disciplined feels, at length, spontaneously a similar inspiration, and gradually acquires a command of harmonious proportions. From such a power the beauties of style naturally put forth like buds and blossoms from a tree; for the style is but the blossom of the mind, or, as a celebrated writer has observed, "the style is the man."† It can be fresh, and vigorous, and fair, only where the mind possesses internal elasticity and power. So the bud opens into a flower; the rains swell it, the vernal breezes fan it, and the sunbeam brings forth its beautiful form to the eye.

But there are those who maintain the direct contrary of all this. "You torment the youth," say they, "with difficulties beyond their powers, and thereby weaken their courage and fill them with disgust, and, in the end, destroy all disposition and all ability to study." It is possible that instruction in classical literature may have all these ill effects; it is probable and even undeniable, where the teacher is injudicious, and his method confused, dry and spiritless. But such a man would ruin any cause, that

\* Herder, in his 43d Letter on the Study of Theology, says: "If you aim at perfection, attend diligently to the rules and examples of the Greeks, for they are the only masters in plan and execution, in drapery and fable. Homer and Sophocles are immortal models in regard to representation, as Aristotle is in his critical observations and rules."

\* \* \* Early reading, under a skilful and thorough teacher, such as Aristotle was, the *Iliad* as a model of simplicity and pathos, and the *Odyssey* as a specimen of complex moral fable, will fix for life in the mind of the student the principles of method and arrangement. From Sophocles, also, who to all this adds an unlimited control over the passions, winding them off, as he proceeds, like thread from a ball, much is to be learned by one who has the requisite capacity. Happy is he, to whom it is given early in life to receive impressions from such specimens, and to form himself, in his best years on such models."—Ed.

† *Le style c'est l'homme.*—BUFFON.

should he committed to him. If he should not seriously injure the mind of the youth, it would be only because the study itself, by its own good tendencies, would have power to repair the damage.

The complaint that there is necessarily too great difficulty in the study of the classics, comes either from those who have no knowledge on these subjects, or from unfortunate individuals, who have suffered the evils of bad training, and who ought to find fault with their teachers rather than with the study.

By this class of objectors, the study of the Latin is admitted as an unavoidable evil. "But the Greek,—the Greek," say they, "is the pest of our youth." It is not without horror that some of the older persons among us remember their distress at the paradigm of the ominous verb, *τύπτω*. But those times are past, and the old method of instruction appears now but as a ghost in the imaginations of the old to the great merriment of the young. There are, indeed, difficulties in the study of the Greek, but they do not transcend the abilities of the young, nor do they consume an unreasonable amount of time. Petrarch wept over a manuscript of Homer in consequence of being unable to read it. Things are now reversed, and many a father almost thinks it an occasion of weeping, that his son can, or does read Greek. This feeling, however, is but the remaining prejudice of by-gone days, fast hastening to its grave from which there will be no resurrection.

If the teacher is worthy of his trust, he will, as may be observed in every good school, soon show his pupils how to overcome the difficulties, which do indeed exist, but which readily yield to enterprise and skill. He will teach them the shortest way (and the most thorough is invariably the shortest) through these difficulties to their object; he will raise their hopes, he will call into exercise their courage, so that, as the result of their toil they shall feel conscious of the reward of increased power and knowledge, the best fruit of instruction, the surest pledge of ultimate success, and the rejoicing of every well-disciplined youthful mind. Nothing but the consciousness of misspent time, and consequent mental imbecility, can create that disgust frequently witnessed in a poor school, the grave of all scientific culture and the hot-bed of unrestrained insolence and vulgarity.

—————Ingenuas didicisse fideliter artes,  
Emollit mores, nec sinit esse feros.\*

The school where the classics are successfully studied is preëminently a place of youthful enterprise and joy, the natural consequence of well-directed study and conscious advancement in knowledge.

It is absurd to suppose that *straining* the powers of the mind will injure it, just as if it were a mechanical instrument. *Overstraining* the mind is, indeed, attended with great evil; and we have a right to expect of every teacher, that he acquaint himself with the measure of his pupil's ability, and never overcharge it. Vigorous effort, if kept within the limits of one's capacities, is always the parent of strength. The mind that is kept in continual exercise, like the arm accustomed to wielding the sword, will thereby accumulate strength and greatly increase its power of rapid execution.

We come now to speak of the influence which classical study has upon *practical education*, both in relation to subsequent [professional] study in the university, and to the active duties of life. The young man whose mind has been well disciplined by classical study, has greatly increased his intellectual power, and his ability to apprehend and manage scientific subjects in general. Already accustomed to the same kind of difficulties which, in a new form, only, will meet him in his university course, practised in forming new mental combinations and in exercising the judgment, and inured to strenuous effort in grasping and mastering a wide range of thought, he finds in the scientific method of his advanced course of study nothing but the application and extension of those principles which, in their elementary character, occupied his youth. Thus qualified to enter upon the higher pursuits of learning, he will soon be able to acquire a mastery over the new materials presented to him, and, by an independent exercise of his own expanding mind, to make a right disposal of them, and to move directly onward, without embarrassment, to still higher attainments. He only who comes to the university with such a preparation, is on the way to distinction. Without that preparation, the student, notwithstanding his swelling manuscripts [of copied lec-

---

\* Ovid, Epist., ex Ponto, II, 9, 47.



tures], and the wisdom which he carries about with him in black and white, however much he may hurry from lecture-room to lecture-room, will, after all, always continue to be in his minority. Should he sooner or later discover his error, he will find, that the object of his education, and perhaps of his whole life, is irreparably lost. Inquire of the professor of law, of medicine, or of theology, and he will point you to the student who has been well-trained in the classics, as the one who bears with most strength and ease the weight of his new labors. Even mathematicians find that students from a good gymnasium make better progress than those who come from practical high schools, where the classics are excluded.

Not less directly does such an education prepare one for the *business of life*. I mean not that petty business which barely administers to our immediate necessities, but that comprehensive business, to the prompt and energetic performance of which, enlarged views, great principles, wisdom in deliberation, power in execution, and an indomitable and enterprising spirit, trained to severities and hardships, and stimulated by the recollection of noble examples, is indispensable. No nation is destitute of lofty sentiment or of noble examples, which if sufficiently known might serve to stimulate other nations. Many are as rich in these as were the Greeks and Romans. But with none are greatness, magnanimity, heroism, practical wisdom, and all the public virtues, so fully exhibited, and so perpetuated in immortal works of poetry, history, eloquence, politics and philosophy, as with these two ancient nations. Many a hero, not only before Agamemnon, as Horace says, but after him, has fallen into oblivion unwept, for having no sacred bard, or gifted chronicler to immortalize his deeds. Only that representation of greatness in which the deed itself, the sentiment, and the virtue exercised, shine forth in their full splendor, acts with effect upon the youthful mind, and moulds it with a plastic power. Such rich repositories of counsels and examples, of sound views and just principles, of confidence in action and fortitude in suffering, have a mighty power in forming the character of the young. What Cicero says of Cæsar, viz., that he acted and wrote in the same spirit, is true to a greater or less extent of other ancient writers. They

were mostly men, formed in active life, in the very midst of its events, practised, in managing great interests; and their wisdom and experience passed directly over from their actions to their writings.

That *translations* of the best works of both languages may do something for mental culture, I have learned from the experiments that I have made. But to say nothing of the imperfections of such helps, it is impossible, even with the best translations, to give a true idea of an original work. It will never be anything more than an imperfect imitation, belonging rather to the literature of the language into which it is translated, than to that of the language from which it is taken. The peculiar character and spirit of a people can be learned only from their own language and mode of representation. Beside all this, translations furnish no mental discipline, and are of but little value in forming the taste. On account of the facility with which they are used, they belong to that class of writings which are given to the young more for their amusement than for discipline.

By abandoning Greek literature, as some propose, and in limiting the schools to the study of the Roman authors, we exclude our youth from the fairer portion of ancient learning. We limit them not only to what is derived from the Greek and is far inferior to it in originality and freshness, but to that which cannot even be comprehended without the other. The Latin writers are continually referring us back to the Greek fountains,—to the sentiments and forms of expression from which their own were borrowed, and, for the most part, in such a way that the copy cannot be understood without a comparison of the original.

Furthermore, the happy effects of a classical education, as above described, depend on the joint study of both languages. Far be it from us to affirm, that a long and close intimacy with the noblest productions of the Roman authors, with the works of Cicero, Sallust, Tacitus, Virgil and others, will not secure discipline. But what we would say is, that a study of classical literature which shall embrace all antiquity, presents a much wider scope of mental culture, and crowns the labors of the student with more than a two-fold harvest. Here, at least, the half is not better than the whole. Hence Horace, in training the young Piso, does not refer him to his own writings,

nor to those of the older Roman authors, but to those of the Greeks :

————— Vos exemplaria Graeca  
Nocturna versate manu, versate diurna.\*

If it be said that the study of the Greek consumes the time that ought to be devoted to more useful studies, and that it infringes upon the Latin, we reply, that there are schools enough, where the study of both languages has been prosecuted with success, to refute the charge. Ten years,†—from eight to eighteen,—what an amount of time ! If it be wisely employed,—if useless studies, those which contribute nothing to discipline, be excluded and the useful and the valuable be skilfully arranged and zealously pursued, there would be more reason to fear that in ten long years the youth would get out of employ, than that there would not be time enough for their studies, if in such things it were possible to have too much time. But the assertion, that the study of the Latin is injured by that of the Greek, is contradicted by all experience. For a period of nearly twenty years, during which I have been a teacher in public schools, not a single case has occurred where the pupil who distinguished himself in Greek, was not a good master of the Latin, and vice versa ; but where one has failed in Greek, it has been no better with him in Latin. All the teachers whom I have questioned on this point have confirmed my own observation. This sure test of manifold experience, all leading to the same result, is an incontestable proof that when the pupil fails in the Latin, the cause does not lie in the study of the Greek, but in his own incapacity or want of application. And yet no opinion is more prevalent than the one just noticed. It is found that the study of the Latin does not sufficiently flourish in our schools. “Only impose restrictions on the Greek,” it is said, “or banish it, and devote the time thus gained to the Latin, and the evil will soon be remedied.” The Greek will hereby be less cultivated, indeed ; so much is certain. Nor is it less certain that by the removal of this branch of study, the school will sink in its literary character ; but that the Latin will therefore flourish is an idle expectation. In arithme-

\* *Ars Poetica*, 269.

† The present term of study in most of the German gymnasia.—ED.

tic, to be sure, two and two make four; but in the school-room doubling the hours of study does not double the amount of acquisition. The teacher who instructs his pupils in Latin six hours in the week, would not make them advance in it more rapidly, were he to curtail their Greek studies, and have them devote to the Latin the time thus gained. Let the teacher procure a skilful associate, and let them divide the two languages between them, and they will be able to lead forward the youth of good parts rapidly in both languages at the same time; whereas the less disciplined pupil though devoting double the time to the study of the Latin, will be the inferior Latin scholar. The skill of the teacher and the diligence of the pupil are here the productive powers. If both these are in vigorous action, success in both languages is certain; if they are not, it is in vain to attempt to increase success in the one by withdrawing the attention from the other. The one, as well as the other, will remain a barren field; and the reformer will only prove his utter inexperience in matters of instruction, which are not understood by every one who has passed through the schools.

But, on the other hand, a regard for the Greek, for the beauty of the language, for the rich variety and perfection of its works, must not be allowed to mislead us, as it has many schools, to make the study of that language the basis of education, and to give the Latin a subordinate rank. The whole fabric of our education and learning has a Latin foundation. Besides, the Latin language, notwithstanding the extent to which modern languages have taken its place, is still the common language of the learned. It is suitable, therefore, that the student be trained to write in it according to the best models, and even to compose in verse. But the Greek is remoter from daily use, and therefore the same kind of mastery in it is not indispensable. It is not so important to be able to express one's thoughts in Attic Greek, as it is to write pure Latin. The object of education is not to be able to write Greek poetry, but to understand accurately the productions of the Greek poets, to perceive all their excellences and feel their power. Nor does this imply that translations into Greek are to be banished from our schools; on the contrary, these are the very best means of arriving at a nice acquaintance with the language, and the only sure proof



of having made the attainment. If the Latin be made the basis of education, it will facilitate instruction in the Greek, for it will accustom the student to the same kind of study that is requisite in the latter. To this may be added another facility in the acquisition of the Greek, originating in the greater regularity, and if properly treated, greater simplicity, of the Greek grammar. The Latin, therefore, should be commenced earlier than the Greek, and, through the whole course, have the larger portion of time allotted to it. A well-regulated school may safely adopt this method, still adhering to the principle of a comprehensive and thorough study of both languages; for such an arrangement will, after all, give the Greek a full equality of rank. The successful study of the latter will be favored not only by the teacher, but by the growing interest of the student. It is a general observation, that pupils who are well trained in the elements of the Greek language, especially the more intellectual among them, contract such a fondness for it as to pursue it with more pleasure than the Latin. An effort of the teacher is, therefore, often necessary to hold the two languages in proper equipoise.

The gymnasium has within itself, indeed, its own objects, as a school of *piety*, of *morality*, of *knowledge*, and *intellectual discipline*. But it holds, furthermore, numerous important relations to *later studies* and to the ultimate aims of a scientific education. In its attempt to satisfy the demands of these latter,—to aim at an object that lies out of itself, there might be a danger of conflicting with its own nature, as a school of discipline, out of regard to practical ends, were it not for the happy circumstance, that its studies are at the same time disciplinary and preparatory to professional pursuits. The study of the two ancient languages, their literature and the circle of knowledge necessary to a comprehension of them, as well as the other studies of the gymnasium, furnish the only sure foundation of the continued existence and progress of literature and science in general. Here, in speaking of science and literature, we will mention theology, law and medicine, not in their practical operation (though this can attain to completeness and certainty, to life and power, only by profound science), but we will regard them in the light of learned professions, seeking a thorough acquaintance with their subjects, tracing

out their origin and progress with all the necessary aids for securing their perpetuity and growth; we will contemplate them as standing upon their high eminences,—as the representatives, the guardians, and the promoters of science.

First, in regard to the *theologian*. It were idle to assert what every body knows, and no one can doubt, that he needs a knowledge of the Latin.\* A more stupid question can hardly be proposed, than that which is sometimes heard, "Of what use is the Latin to a theologian?" It should not be forgotten, in this connection, that, to one ignorant of the Latin language and literature, a thorough knowledge of the Greek is impossible.

*Christianity*, oriental in its origin, did not come to us in a direct way from the place of its birth, but through the medium of Grecian and Roman antiquity. All the original sacred writings of the Christian dispensation are in Greek. It belongs to the very business and calling of a learned theologian, to understand the original documents on which his religion is founded, to be able to explain and defend them, to go into a thorough study of them, and form an independent judgment founded directly on them. With-

---

\* As many good men in our country have entertained and still entertain the opinion so summarily disposed of by our author, we will spread out a few facts before the reader, in confirmation of the above statement. *Why cannot one become a thorough theologian without a knowledge of the Latin?* The general reply is, that modern literature, which first sprung up in Italy, was transplanted from that country to all the other countries of Europe, and the Latin, then the learned language of Italy, became the learned language of all civilized nations. The consequence is, that the aids necessary to a thorough study of theology are not accessible to the mere English student. His biblical apparatus must be very meagre, if all the works written in Latin are to be excluded. He has indeed lexicons for the Greek Testament, but he cannot read one half of them; of the Septuagint he can have none; he can use only one standard Hebrew lexicon, and must be wholly in the power of that one. Thus it is of no use to him that there are such works as Schleusner's two lexicons, Winer's *Simonis* and *Michaelis's Supplementa*. In Old Testament commentary nearly all the best works are beyond his reach, such as Clericus, Masius, S. Schmidt, Vitranga, Calvin, Rosenmüller, Michaelis, Geyer, &c., &c. Many of the best New Testament commentaries are also useless to him. In Rabbinic learning he cannot proceed a single step. Nor can he enjoy the common facilities for studying the classic Greek. What author can he study with a full critical apparatus, and yet be ignorant of Latin? He must study Homer without Damm, Heyne and Spitzner; Herodotus without Wesseling, Schweighäuser, Gaisford or Struve; Thucydides without Poppe or Göller; Pindar without Heyne, Böckh or Dissen; Demosthenes without any able commentaries, and so of all the rest.

In systematic theology (if one does not despise the productions of the most devout men and profound thinkers) where will the English student find an equivalent for Turretin, Buddeus, Quenstadt and others of no less value.

In church history, how far will he be able to proceed in his inquiries? Let any one examine the *sources* of church history as presented by Gieseler and see what language must be understood in order to institute any special inquiry in church history.

We have often been asked by English students who wished to be *learned theologians*, what books we could recommend in the different branches of theological study. We could scarcely do better than refer them to a Sabbath school depository. If one insist on having something more, then he must accept the recommendation of a Latin grammar.—Ed.

out this, a fundamental knowledge of theological science is inconceivable. That a preacher may be very useful with little or even no knowledge of the Greek, and that circumstances often render such a man's course excusable, is unquestionable. But the assertion, in general terms, that the Christian minister does not need a knowledge of Greek, that he may thus remove theology from its foundation, that he may seal up its sources, betrays an inexcusable irreverence for Christianity in its pristine form, and a faithlessness in pursuing and defending its purity. It is justly demanded of theology, the first and greatest of the sciences, that it be faithful to its solemn trust; and it would be dishonoring Christianity to suppose that a preacher and interpreter of divine revelation might be ignorant of it in its original form, while Turks and Tartars demand of their religious teachers that they learn the Arabic and study the Koran in the original language.

As with the sacred documents of Christianity, so is it with the works of the Christian Fathers. They, also, are written chiefly in Greek.

[In reply to the objection that Rationalism sprung from the kind of learning here recommended, he says], Investigation can be met only by investigation, and false results by true results. It is the spear of Achilles, which alone can heal the wounds it has made, and in this work the most extensive and profound learning is the most indispensable aid to theology. In this profession there never was a time of general peace and inactivity; and he whose duty it is to maintain the pillars of our faith, may never flee from his post and leave his weapons to be employed against it. Christianity made its way into the world in opposition to the wisdom which called it folly, and conquered its power. It will stand any future trial; for the same divine power which resides in it, guides the history of mankind, and will conduct it in those channels which Providence has marked out. To suppose that we must flee and hide ourselves because the enemy approaches, is to misunderstand Christianity, and to lose our confidence of *its* power from a consciousness of *our* weakness. It is not a frail bark drifting at the mercy of the waves, but a rock in the ocean having its foundation in the depths of the earth below which no tempest can move.

The science of *law* as well as theology comes to us from antiquity, though more directly from the Romans. [We omit this paragraph, as the civil or Roman law is but little studied in our professional schools; and also the next, on medicine, as connected with Greek literature.]

In naming the three learned professions, we have made no direct allusion to other branches of a liberal education, such as *intellectual philosophy, history, eloquence* and *poetry*. The first of these, as well as the rest has its foundation in the writings of antiquity. Greek literature contains not only the beginnings, but the fairer portion, nay the most essential part, of mental philosophy. Whatever changes and modifications particular doctrines have, in the processes of modern criticism, undergone, the great problems of philosophy were there comprehended, and solved, and laid down in works, not only with the freshness of new discovery and originality, but with a method of treatment which excites the admiration of later ages and still serves as a model for imitation. Here a wide field has been laid open for observation by recent investigations respecting the doctrines of the Ionic, the Eleatic, the Pythagorean and the Platonic schools; and the new results which are hereby gained, shed a clearer and broader light over the whole range of philosophic inquiry. Without going back to those original fountains of philosophy, it will be impossible for us to take a wide survey of its entire history, and learn our own true position. As no one can pretend to be a scientific theologian, who is not master of the original Scriptures, so can no one be regarded as a learned philosopher, who must inquire of others, be they translators or commentators, in order to know what Plato or Aristotle taught.

The historian finds himself sustaining a similar relation to classical literature. Whether it be his object to trace out the history of the nations of antiquity, and unfold their peculiarities, or to familiarize himself with models of historical composition, his first study must be the classics. So also is it with the geographer, the chronologist, the mythologist and the antiquary. No one of them can dispense with a knowledge of the ancient languages. He who is preparing for any one of these departments without such knowledge, will find his education a failure.



Not less inseparably connected with the study of antiquity is elegant literature. I will not again recur to the historians and orators. We are still defective in both respects,\* and not till our youth, by a long intimacy with the masters of Greece and Rome, learn the secret of their power, will they be able to equal their productions. Our poetry made a noble beginning in narrative verse and in the songs of the *Minne*, but soon declined. Again the Silesian poetry, partly in modern style, flourished for a time, but it passed away without effect. After several successful attempts in the first half of the last century, Klopstock raised our poetry to a manly character, and his strong mind, imbued with the spirit of Zion's sacred bard, and with Pindar's lofty strain, shows, especially in his odes, how the study of the ancient classics can mould a noble genius without destroying its peculiarities, and elevate it to a style of poetry, which will remind one of those ancient masters, and at the same time breathe a truly national spirit, elsewhere scarcely to be found. With what success Göthe, and after him Schiller, drank in the Greek tragedy, and thereby refined and elevated their own powers, the former has shown in his *Iphigenia*, the latter in his *Wallenstein* and still more in the *Bride of Messina*. No sooner was our literature brought by exalted genius into contact with the best classical productions, as by Herder in the anthology, and Voss in the Homeric epos and the idyll, than works of a kindred spirit, and still peculiarly national, appeared as the fruit, and we had an abundance of the most touching elegies and epigrams, and epic songs, as the *Louise* of Voss and the *Hermann and Dorothea* of Göthe.

We have imitated our neighbors, at one time the French, than the Italians or Spanish, and finally ourselves; and what is the consequence? Miserable flowers without fragrance or beauty, which have withered like the mown grass, whereas the works mentioned above, are still in full bloom, having an indigenous growth and constituting the true ornaments of our literature, and such they will remain, as long as the language shall endure. Is this difference accidental? Impossible.

---

\* In the department of history, in connection with philology, the Germans have done much since the above was written.—Ed.

Cease, then, ye graceless, spiritless poets, ye shadows of those lofty German geniuses who drank deeply at the Castalian fountains; ye admirers of our gray antiquity, who discern not its productive elements; ye historians, with ponderous tomes of chaotic learning, and words upon words without soul or spirit, cease to malign the mother which has nourished the greatest and best of our native poets, and which proffers the same nutriment and fostering influence to the intellect and heart of every gifted youth who will subject himself to her discipline. He will, if he follow in the tracks of his great predecessors, find himself on the true road to distinction, and will be able to sustain the honor and the fresh vigor of our national literature.

To sum up these remarks in a few words, *modern civilized nations have not become what they are through themselves*. Our religion, laws, science and refinement have descended to us from antiquity, and are inseparably connected with it. Classical literature is not only the necessary medium through which this connection is to be kept, but is in itself the direct instrument for upholding and perfecting all the sciences and all the culture that grows out of them. As the direct object of education, the formation of the intellectual character, is best attained by this means, so also the foundations and pillars of the whole fabric of our culture are thus most securely fixed, and those who would remove this study from its present prominent position in our learned schools, would so far as in them lies, obscure the light which has blessed the world. The consequence of such an outrage against the highest interests of humanity would be the relapse of science, and the loss of that vigor which the revival of letters gave to Europe.

But we must not close without noticing the objections of those who do not directly deny the good effects of a classical education, but think that it is hazardous to Christianity and good morals.

"Continued and close intimacy with the works of *impure heathens*," it is said, "weakens and destroys Christian feelings and sentiments, corrupts the morals and blunts the sensibilities. By bringing the youth into close contact with paganism with all its attractions, this study tends to alienate their hearts from revealed religion, and

to fill the imagination with seductive images, which can be contemplated only at the expense of piety."

The accusation, you observe, is like that of Anytus against Socrates; "he introduces new gods and corrupts the youth," an appeal to the passions to strengthen the force of argument.

That many teachers and dignitaries of the church have openly declared against "heathen" writers, is undeniable. But their voice is lost amid the concurrent declarations of others of equal talent and piety, who maintain that classical study is at the same time an aid and an ornament to the church. \* \* \*

The fables of the ancient mythology do, indeed, present many poetical charms; but how any one can be in danger of adopting the belief of such a fabulous religion in the place of Christianity, is inconceivable. The supposition is opposed to all experience. On the contrary, the moment these fables cease to be regarded as poetical fictions, they appear as ridiculous to the student as they did to the philosophers before the introduction of Christianity, and only make him the more strongly feel the necessity of the latter. This very consideration operated upon the early Christians in such a way as to strengthen their attachment to the Christian faith, and led many pagans, who were seeking after truth, to the adoption of Christianity. That must be a weak intellect, indeed, that can see more divinity in those fantastic traditions than in the character of Christ and his apostles, or sooner repose its confidence in the former than in the latter.

As to the *moral influence* of the writings of the ancient Greeks and Romans, the more offensive parts cannot justly be presented by themselves as a sufficient reason for abandoning ancient literature altogether. Every age has its corruptions, which in innumerable forms spread among every people and in every country. In regard to *schools*, the question relates to the seductions of vice as depicted in books. Ancient literature has its share of such productions. So the literature of every modern nation contains works which no one can safely put into the hands of the young. If such an objection were valid against ancient literature, it would, if carried out to its legitimate results, proscribe all literature, the German not excepted. All teachers of youth agree in this, that books of immoral

tendency are not to be given to the young. No one would recommend that the whole of Petronius or Martial should be put into a student's hands. Such authors should be passed by entirely; or at most only selections from them, in the form of a Chrestomathy, should be read. But, alas! the corrupting influence of bad books of all kinds and in all languages, which have no connection with the schools, is so great, that any danger arising from classic text-books is not to be named in comparison. Besides, there are the temptations of the theatre, of profligate associates and of pernicious example. Every step of the young man of ardent passions is liable to plunge him into ruin. The best safeguard is that of moral principle, which must be assiduously instilled, so that a young man may have within himself the antidote of corruption. "The virtue," says an English writer, "which can never be trusted, is not worth watching over."

---

#### ARTICLE IV.

##### ON THE PREJUDICE AGAINST PIETY AS HOSTILE TO OUR PRESENT HAPPINESS.

THE most effectual way to vindicate the truth is sometimes to explore the sources of the error which stands opposed to it, and then leave the truth, after having thus removed the misconceptions which hung around it, to shine by its own light. We shall apply this principle, in the remarks which we are about to offer on the subject named in the title of this article. We need not delay, to prove to our readers the existence of the error to which we ask their attention. Every person can bear witness to it, either from his present consciousness of what is still true respecting himself on this subject, or from his recollection of what has been at some past period of his life. Every Christian minister, in particular, can testify how widely it prevails, and how powerfully it resists his efforts to convince men of their duty and interest. Of no class is this more true than of the young; it is the grand delusion by which they are more liable to be ensnared than by any



other,—this disposition, that is, to regard religion as the enemy of their present happiness: as a gloomy service; as desirable only in affliction and sickness and death; and hence not to be embraced and submitted to, till there is nothing else left for which they can live.

As already intimated, we shall not attempt, in opposition to this error, to trace the direct operation of piety upon the present welfare and happiness of men; the exemption which it brings from anxious cares and corroding passions—the victory which it gives over the fear of death—the glorious and infinite future which it spreads out to the eye of faith—its power to exalt and refine our joys, to alleviate our sorrows, and arm us against all the inevitable ills of life. Upon this more positive aspect of the subject we shall not dwell, but turn to another, which, although less frequently exhibited, vindicates not less strongly, we think, the claim of religion to the happy tendencies which the above description attributes to it. Our design, in other words, is, to examine some of the principal sources from which the prejudice in question seems to have sprung; and thus to show, from their insufficiency to warrant it, how groundless and unauthorized is the prejudice itself.

1. We cannot doubt that those, who regard religion as a system of restraints to which they could not submit and be happy, are influenced more or less in this opinion by the consciousness of a *want of sympathy between the duties of religion and their own hearts*. A person, who is a stranger to the practical obligations of piety, may yet have a very clear and accurate perception of their nature and extent. If he has been instructed in the truths of the gospel, and has heard them preached faithfully, and has a conscience in some degree enlightened, he may form such exact ideas of the Christian service, that he can not only see what it requires of himself, but detect the slightest external deviation from it in those who profess to have entered upon it and to be performing the duties which it involves. Hence it is, that none are so ready to observe and censure the inconsistencies of Christian professors, as many of those who live, and boast that they live, in open exemption from the restraints of the gospel. Regardless as they are of the self-denial which it requires them to practise, and pursuing as they do with engrossing

eagerness, the objects of this life, they yet know that to be a real Christian, a man must moderate and subdue his inordinate desires, and, dying to the world, have his life hidden with Christ in God. They know that he must delight in communion with God, in meditation upon his word, in fellowship with his people; that he must look upon all temporal objects with a manifestly subordinate regard, must have full sympathy with Christ's spirit, must live not for himself, must make God's will the rule, and God's favor the reward, of all his actions. But to such a course as this every feeling of the irreligious heart is strongly opposed. The unconverted man sees this the moment he considers what the requirements of religion are. He perceives at once, that there is no correspondence between them and the state of his own heart; that his affections cling to other objects; that his inclinations impel him for happiness to other sources; and hence, in his ignorance of the manner in which Christianity compensates for the sacrifices it requires, he infers, that by submitting to its authority, he would both lose the means of enjoyment at present within his reach, and bind himself to obligations, which must prove to such a heart as his a burden only and a weariness. Thus he judges as to himself. He supposes the same must be true as to others. He thinks of Christians as possessed of his own feelings, and thence draws the conclusion, that they must be as wretched as he is conscious that he himself would be in their situation. It is in this way, perhaps, more than in any other, that we are to account for the world's error in regard to the present value of a hope in Christ. The source of the mistake here, who does not see? This reasoning from a state of impenitence to one of grace overlooks a most important fact in the argument. The Christian's duties, it should be remembered, are not performed with a sinner's heart. If this were so, then the sinner's inference would be also true, that those duties are a burden and only a burden to those who perform them. But it is not so. If a person be a Christian, he is such for the very reason, that he has been inspired with dispositions which had no place in his heart before, and which call into existence there desires and cravings, which can find their appropriate gratification in God only. If any man be in Christ Jesus, he is a new creature.

The moral taste of his soul is changed. He has henceforth new views, new affections, new purposes. He loves now the things to which he was formerly averse, and is averse to the things which he formerly loved. It is manifest, therefore, that any opinion in regard to the effect of religion, which omits the consideration of this *change*, must of course be erroneous. It is precisely this mistake which all those commit, who think to judge what the Christian's experience is, from what they are conscious *their own* would be, had they to perform his spiritual work, with their own unsanctified, impenitent hearts. It is a false test clearly; and so far as it is the application of this test which has led any of our readers to suppose that it would diminish their present happiness to embrace the gospel, they must see that they entertain an opinion unwarranted and untrue.

2. We proceed to remark, in the second place, upon the error of judging in regard to the subsequent experience of Christians, from that distress of mind which commonly precedes conversion. This error is often committed, and involves necessarily the other error of supposing that the rewards of piety are all future, and that the fruits which it yields here are disquietude and fear, dejection and sorrow. We shall not insist that the distress of mind, to which we refer, is no necessary part of conversion. As a matter of fact, whatever may be true as to the necessity of the connection, it is, we admit, rarely separated from it. Very few break away from the bondage of sin at a single effort. Nay, the struggle is commonly severe and prolonged, even beyond what can be readily conceived by those who have never known it by their own experience. It may be doubted whether a livelier image of the world of despair is often witnessed on earth, than that of the spectacle of a sinner suddenly awaking to a full view of his situation. His conscience,—that dreadful attribute of a ruined mind,—now begins her work. His memory brings up from the depths of forgetfulness sins which he supposed were buried there for ever. Every glance at the past sends new pangs of remorse through his soul; and to look forward, is to see the blackness of despair brooding over all his prospects. In many cases, the convicted sinner has a cup of sorrow pressed to his lips, for the time being, scarcely less unmingled and

bitter than that of those who drink of it with no hope that it will ever pass from them. Not that all who may have become Christians can attest the truth of this representation, in its full extent; and just so many exceptions as there are, so much it detracts, of course, from the force of the objection. But we meet the objection in its strongest form, and allow that such a record as that, for instance, which Andrew Fuller has given respecting the process of his conversion, is the faithful record of the experience of many others. "The reproaches," he says, "of a guilty conscience seemed like the gnawing worm of hell. The breach of my vows, and the shocking termination of my former hopes and affections, all uniting together, formed a burden which I knew not how to bear. I thought surely that must be an earnest of hell itself. The fire and brimstone of the bottomless pit seemed to burn within my bosom." It is not strange, perhaps, when we consider the precipitancy with which many judge on religious subjects, that they should receive, from their knowledge of such cases, a false impression in regard to the difficulties under which the Christian pursues his way to heaven. How many are there, who, seeing him overwhelmed thus with distress at his very entrance upon it, have been led to regard his whole subsequent progress in it as of the same tenor, continuing to the end as painful and cheerless, as it appears at the beginning.

But such an inference, as a little reflection must show, is certainly premature and untrue. We feel compelled so to regard it, if for no other reason, because it confounds the difference which exists between conviction, which is only preparatory to conversion, and conversion itself. The two states are so different, that a person must be utterly misled, who argues from the one to the other. The feelings of a sinner, conscience-smitten, still retaining his opposition to God, and through unbelief despairing of mercy, present as perfect a contrast as could be well imagined to the feelings of the same sinner, penitent, subdued and rejoicing in hope.

"As when a felon, whom his country's laws  
Have justly doomed for some atrocious cause,  
Expects, in darkness and heart-chilling fears,  
The shameful close of all his misspent years;



If chance, on heavy pinions slowly borne,  
 A tempest usher in the dreaded morn,  
 Upon his dungeon walls the lightning play,  
 The thunder seems to summon him away,  
 The warder at the door his key applies,  
 Shoots back the bolt, and all his courage dies :  
 If then, just then, all thoughts of mercy lost,  
 When hope, long lingering, yields the ghost,  
 The sound of pardon pierce his startled ear,  
 He drops at once his fetters and his fear ;  
 A transport glows in all he looks and speaks,  
 And the first thankful tears bedew his cheeks.  
 Joy, far superior joy, that much outweighs  
 The comfort of a few poor added days,  
 Invades, possesses, and o'erwhelms the soul  
 Of him, whom hope has with a touch made whole."

Be it so, then, that you must traverse a dark and gloomy passage before you arrive at the gates of wisdom ; this is no proof whatever, that when once within those gates, you may not journey on to the end of your pilgrimage in ways of pleasantness and paths of peace. No ; this you certainly may do. Christians, except in cases of some peculiar mental infirmity, have nothing but their own unfaithfulness to blame, if, after the day-star of hope has visited their hearts, they do not keep it, with more or less distinctness, constantly in view, to guide and cheer them, till the sun of the "new heavens" breaks forth upon them in everlasting splendor.

We must protest against the conclusion which has been named, on another ground. We hold it to be entirely unjust to charge to the account of piety consequences, which, so far from producing, it would have prevented, had not its claims been disregarded ; and, more than this, which consequences, after this neglect has ceased, it brings to an end just so far as it has scope to exert its legitimate influence. All those painful feelings, usually attendant upon conviction, have their origin, not a single one of them excepted, in the course of life which the sinner is required to abandon, and not in that which he is required by the gospel to embrace and pursue. In proof of this, we have only to recollect what it is which occasions the distress of the anxious sinner. One principal cause of it is remorse of conscience ; no pang of which can cross any human bosom, till guilt, whose attendant and avenger it is, has opened the way for its entrance. So far, then, as it is from this source

that those suffer who are beginning to consider and reform their ways, it is clearly any thing but religion which should be charged with making them unhappy; they are unhappy, because they have not been religious; because they have been worldly; because they have forgotten God, and withheld from him the service which he claimed. In the second place, the allegation is equally unfair as regards that part of their distress which arises from a fear of the retributions of eternity. They would see as little in the future to dread as in the past to regret, had they not broken the law of Jehovah and thus made it their enemy. It is not piety, therefore, it is a consciousness of the want of piety, which excites their apprehension, and "writes a doomsday sentence on the heart," as they look forward to the retributions of eternity. Nor, once more, can piety with any more reason be reproached as the author of that dreadful struggle which so often rends the bosoms of those who are deciding whether God or the world shall be supreme in their affections. All the agony of this struggle, whether considered in reference to its origin, or its continuance, or its severity, is chargeable upon the sinner's obstinacy in withstanding his convictions of duty, refusing to desist from his rebellion and submit to the Lord Jesus Christ.

The sum, then, of what has been said relative to the point before us is this: Those, who take their ideas of the Christian life from the painful trials of its commencement, err, for a two-fold reason; first, because they forget that those trials cease, even on supposition of their being caused by religion, so soon as the change from sin to holiness is accomplished,—light then succeeds to darkness,—peace to disorder,—hope to despair; and, in the second place, because they mistake the source of those trials, and witness in them, not a development of the tendency of religion, but the natural, unavoidable effects of having never possessed it.

3. We shall not err, we think, in referring, in further explanation of this subject, to the influence which religious biographies often have in promoting gloomy views of piety. In this remark, we allude more particularly to that portion of these biographies which consists of the *diaries* of those whose lives they record, and which purport to describe their private exercises, and to reflect faith-

fully all the lights and shadows of their Christian experience. It would be out of place here, to discuss the question which has been raised respecting the utility, on the whole, of such disclosures of the *secret* history of the believer. No doubt there are many and most important advantages resulting from it; and it is equally certain, that there are evils attending the practice. One of these evils, beyond question, is, that in many cases a false impression is received, because a false view is given, in regard to the degree of happiness which piety confers upon its possessor. In nearly all the diaries of eminent Christians which have been spread before the world, we have a much fuller account of the conflicts which they sustained, than of the victories which they achieved; they are in the main so filled with the recital of what they suffered, of gloomy doubts and fears, of resolutions broken, and views of duty unattained, and relieved only at comparatively distant intervals with gleams of a brighter sky and more cheerful hopes, that the reader, who is not himself a Christian, is almost compelled to feel that such men, whatever may be thought of the wisdom of their conduct as regards another world, can have had but little true enjoyment here; and hence, that if this be true of such persons, who by universal consent have illustrated, in the highest degree, the usual tendency of religion, much more must it be true of the great body of Christians.

But here again we must call in question the correctness of the inference. We may be allowed to doubt whether these records really present an exact transcript of the experience of their authors in the matter which we are now considering. In the first place, those more equal frames of the mind,—in which, after all, even the more favored Christian must pass the greater part of his life,—for he could not live and be always in a state either of agony or rapture,—are apt to receive very little notice, and often to be wholly omitted in the diaries of the pious. This fact claims very serious consideration in determining whether Christians enjoy so much less than other men, under the influence of their peculiar hopes and fears. It suggests a most important rule to be observed in reading religious journals; and that is, that we should fill up the chasms in point of time which occur in them so often, by assuming, that these intervals were at least seasons

of tranquillity and peace; the reason why they are excluded from the record being, that if they were not marked by ecstatic joy, so neither were they by any peculiar depression. It will be found, that by making this allowance, by far the greater part of life is still left, even in the case of those biographies, which might seem most unfavorable to the argument, during which the subjects of them, instead of being so very sad and cheerless, enjoyed quite as much as ordinarily falls to the lot of human beings. And is not the rule proposed a reasonable one? To overlook it, and allow a too active imagination to spread the gloomy colors in which the Christian may have depicted his darkest hours, over his whole life, is, it strikes us, very much as if you should read the journal of the tourist, and conclude that all the days, of which *nothing* is said, were days of tempest and gloom, because *some* are marked as such here and there, or that every place he visits, which is not praised as a "sunny Rhodes," must have been overhung with chilly damps and murky vapors. In the second place, we are to make allowance also for the fact, that it is somehow more natural for the Christian to give prominence in his record to his less favored than to his happy frames; perhaps, because, by a singular contrariety of motives, he feels, as if it would savor of pride to dwell much on what might seem to be proofs that he regarded himself as standing high in the favor of God, while, on the other hand, human-like,—*in vitium ducit culpae fuga*,—he is, in reality, gratifying the very pride he would shun, by the apparent humility of so freely confessing his sins, and acknowledging his desert of the self-reproach and upbraiding and sorrow which they bring upon him.

To show that these are not mere refinements of thought, let us take a case,—that of Henry Martyn, whose biography is read by the religious and irreligious more extensively, perhaps, than any similar work in our language, and which has done as much as any other, to determine the views of its readers respecting the nature and tendency of religion. We are happy, that it is *such* a book which exerts *such* an influence; for we know not where among men a more faultless model could be found, or from what merely human source impressions, more strictly conformed to the true type, could be derived. Yet, amid all the admiration which is spontaneously paid by every reader



to the lofty purity of his character and the moral heroism of his life, how many, while they have read and admired, have more than suspected that Henry Martyn must have been gloomy and austere; that his heart was oftener pierced with sorrows than thrilled with joys; that he had, beyond a very narrow range, but little sympathy with his species, or they with him. But what was the fact? His biographer, having learnt that many had conceived precisely this idea of Martyn from reading his Memoirs, has felt it due to truth to counteract, as far as possible, the false impression, in the later editions of the work. Referring, in relation to this point, to those who like himself had known this eminent Christian and missionary personally, he says: "They, also, with me, can aver, that Henry Martyn was not less cheerful as a companion than he was warm-hearted and consistent as a friend. Those who imagined that a smile scarcely ever played upon his countenance, that his manner was cold and forbidding, would have been startled at hearing his hearty laugh, which still sounds in my ears, and in seeing little children climbing his knees, affording him a pleasure as great as they themselves received."

We are inclined to think, that a similar, although by no means equal, difference, must exist between the impression, in this respect, of those who were personally acquainted with the late Dr. Payson, and of such as know him only through the medium of his biography. "The feature of it," says the author, "most obnoxious to censure, is its melancholy. In the detail of desponding feelings, doubts, and temptations, unhappy consequences to the reader have been feared." Yet it is not probable, that many in the habit of meeting him in the intercourse of life, who witnessed his manners, and heard his conversation, ever perceived or suspected any such very decided predominance of the gloomy element in his piety as the Memoirs disclose. Such persons must have heard and seen a thousand things, the demonstrations and product of a joyous heart, of which the pen has preserved no trace, and which would essentially modify the aspect of his religious experience, as presented to us in his journal. It must be so. That "poet's eye," which was so eminently his, glancing, in the best, true sense of the expression, "from heaven to earth, from earth to heaven," could not have always

rested upon sombre scenes; nor that imagination, in which he was so richly gifted, as it "bodied forth the forms of things unknown," have converted them all to images of terror and despair. We do not dislike, on the whole, the practice, so much in vogue at present, of allowing the subjects of religious biography "to speak for themselves," as it is termed; but in this particular, we think that none do them so little justice as *themselves*; and we still need, after their voice has been heard, the testimony of others to enable us to form a correct judgment. Thus, in this case, the testimony of one who knew the sainted Payson well, is, as we should expect on general principles, but by no means from the tenor of the narrative,—“That in conversation his thoughts flew from him in every possible variety of harmony and beauty, like birds from a South American forest.” How many such scenes,—in which, for the time at least, the heart must be free as well as the mind,—in all probability, enlivened the hours of his intercourse with others, but which have shed no ray of their light upon the mournful record of his conflicts and sorrows.

It is plain, therefore, that some qualifications should be admitted, as to the extent in which we allow our first impressions of biography to influence us on this subject. As in portraying the human countenance, so in these sketches of Christian experience, the likeness may be very just and striking for those who have known the original, and consequently can associate with each feature the exact expression, and so combine the whole as to give a true unity to their conceptions; whereas others, who have no such knowledge to guide them, are liable, in supplying the deficiency from imagination, to mingle with the much that is true so much that is false, that the delineation before them represents to their minds a very different person, and one which the original, could they be introduced to it, would very imperfectly realize. What we desire is, that these and other similar causes of error here may be duly considered; so that Christianity, instead of suffering from the imperfections of our knowledge, may be fairly judged, being neither denied the credit of happiness which she has really conferred, nor reproached as the occasion of miseries which she never produced.

4. Again, we think it deserves inquiry, whether false tests for judging of the happiness of men are not frequently applied, and whether it is not owing to this, in part, that Christians are supposed to enjoy so little. How is it that the world judges commonly on this subject? Very many, nearly all, till religion has corrected their error, or age moderated their passions, associate happiness with great hilarity of spirits, with a fondness for scenes of merriment and noise, with that insensibility or recklessness of mind which flings care to the winds, and revels upon the joys of the moment.

“Come, knit hands, and beat the ground  
In a light fantastic round.”

On the contrary, an aversion to such scenes of gaiety and excitement, sedateness of manner, and seriousness in speech and aspect, are apt to be regarded as the indications of a sad and disconsolate heart. It is easy to see what judgment will be formed, when such principles regulate the decision. The worldly, who crowd eternity from their thoughts, and vainly grasp at the mere phantoms of happiness, appear, as seen through such a medium, to have more of its reality, than the children of faith and heirs of a portion yet to be realized. For no joy, if there be any proportion between its loudness and its depth, can vie with their joy; “the harp and the viol, the tabret and the pipe, and wine are in their feast.” We might think, to see them in their revelry, that no cloud had ever darkened their sky, or fear or sorrow saddened their hearts. We do not say, that this appearance is always and altogether a mere delusion; but we do say, that mere visible signs in such a case are by no means to be trusted. The world’s secret has not been so faithfully kept, as to permit us to be so deceived. It is not in vain, surely, that so many have made trial of its power to render them happy, under every advantage which could promise success, and in the end been compelled to own their disappointment and deplore their folly. What, for instance, can be more instructive and affecting than the confession, with which the celebrated Chesterfield withdrew from the stage, on which he had been so long the admiration and envy of the world. “I have seen,” said he, “the silly rounds of

business and pleasure, and have done with them all. I have enjoyed all the pleasures of the world, and consequently know their futility, and do not regret their loss. I appraise them at their real value, which is in truth very low; whereas those who have not experienced, always overrate them. They only see their gay outside, and are dazzled with their glare; but I have been behind the scene. When I reflect upon what I have seen, what I have heard, and what I have done, I can hardly persuade myself, that all that frivolous hurry, and bustle, and pleasure of the world had any reality; but I look upon all that has passed, as one of those romantic dreams which opium commonly occasions; and I by no means desire to repeat the nauseous dose for the sake of the fugitive dream." Other voices have borne to us the same testimony; and other hearts, O how many! sigh back in silence their mournful echo to its truth. There is not always the frankness to avow it, where the experience is similar. In fact, the appearance of ease and gaiety has been known to have been often assumed for the very purpose of concealing the dissatisfaction, and sorrow, and disappointment which were wasting the soul within. The votaries of pleasure,—for we speak here not so much of the irreligious in general, as those of them, who are addicted to the more noisy vanities and imposing pomps of the world,—are obliged to *seem* cheerful, whether they feel so or not. The character which they have assumed requires it; it cannot be sustained without it; and hence their *apparent* condition is, to say the least, a very equivocal evidence of the actual state of their hearts.

But while the worldly may be thus unhappy amid every outward demonstration of enjoyment, how far, on the other hand, is the Christian from being necessarily sorrowful and afflicted, even at those times when he seems to be in the deepest gloom. Seriousness is not sadness, as such reasoning would imply. The idea is as false in other things as it is in religion; and we may refer, in proof of this, to the experience of the more reflecting of the irreligious themselves. They can testify, that if they have ever known happy moments, it has been when some deep and tranquil seriousness has pervaded their bosoms, the cause of it being, perhaps, some impressive scene in



nature which they have witnessed,\* or something which they have read that has affected them deeply, or reflections of their own adapted to put and actually putting them into a thoughtful mood. Much more true is it, that impressions of a *religious* nature may consist, not merely with composure or peace of mind, but with the highest, the purest joys, of which we are capable. The very sadness of devotion, as some would term it,—and of its other effects we are not led by our object here to speak,—has pleasures connected with it, greater than the merry and dissipated have ever tasted or conceived. Yes, paradox as it may seem to such, Christians know, that if mortals ever experience unmixed happiness, they themselves experience it, as they stand weeping at the foot of the cross, and with hearts overflowing with penitence and grief, lament those sins which nailed their Saviour to that cross of agony and shame. They covet, as most salutary and desirable, the states of mind which others would regard it as the severest infliction to suffer; they feel that they are most exalted when most abased; that by every emotion of sorrow which they can exercise for sin, they are increasing their capacity for more enlarged and deeper joy.

Thus the error, into which men have fallen, is, that they misinterpret the signs in the two cases; that is, they give the worldly credit for all the happiness which they *seem* to possess, and impute to Christians all the unhappiness which they *seem* to suffer. And thus misled by deceptive appearances, they overrate the enjoyment of the former, and undervalue that of the latter, greatly to the discredit and prejudice of the gospel.

5. We observe again, that those who entertain the error under remark, have no doubt been confirmed in it, to some

---

\* The susceptibility of the mind to receive pleasure in this way is recognized, and beautifully illustrated, in the following passage of Beattie's *MINSTREL*.

“ And oft the craggy cliff he loved to climb,  
 When all in mist the world below was lost,  
 What dreadful pleasure! There to stand sublime,  
 Like ship-wrecked mariner on desert coast,  
 And view th’ enormous waste of vapor, tost  
 In billows, lengthening to th’ horizon round  
 Now scooped in gulfs, with mountains now embossed!  
 And hear the voice of mirth and song rebound,  
 Flocks, herds, and waterfalls along the hoar profound.  
 \* \* \* \* \*  
 In darkness and in storm he found *delight*.”

extent, by certain representations which the Bible makes. The descriptions there given of the Christian life may be so viewed, as to give a very wrong impression of its character. Sometimes the believer is represented as a soldier, whom enemies assail from within and without, who must never cease from the conflict, who is to give himself no rest, till he lies down in the grave. Again, he is a pilgrim, whose journey is through a wilderness, abounding at every step with difficulties and dangers. He is the runner of a race, which makes him a spectacle to men and angels, in which he has to lose every thing or gain every thing, and in which none but almost superhuman efforts will secure for him the incorruptible crown. He is forewarned that he must expect from the world persecution and reproach; that he must meet in his way with trials and crosses; that on earth he is but the heir of promises,—that his true rest and inheritance are in heaven. Passages now, presenting the believer in this light, may be so read as to misrepresent his case altogether. The Christian is a soldier, it is true; he has enemies to encounter, whose very name is legion; they are subtle, they are fierce, they are many. But he is a soldier, be it remembered, who fights not alone. An invincible armor has been provided for him. He follows in that war a Captain of salvation, who has conquered death and hell, and who will never suffer him to be put to shame. In that wilderness, too, which he is traversing, he has angels' food to sustain him, and hears voices cheering him, which the world does not hear, and there is the song of joy in the house of his pilgrimage. Listen to the strains of it, as it has been sung by thousands of the saints, as they have journeyed on to their rest in heaven. "Blessed be God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies and the God of all comfort, who comforteth us in all our tribulation; for as the sufferings of Christ abound in us, so our consolation also aboundeth by Christ; as unknown, and yet well known; as dying, and behold we live; as chastened, and not killed; as sorrowful, yet always rejoicing; as poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing, and yet possessing all things." Strange accents these to the ear which faith has not attuned to such mysteries! But the secret of the Lord is with them that fear him. They have an experience which enables them to

reconcile the apparent contradiction, and to understand and use such language. Admit it, then, that the believer, in entering into fellowship with Christ, has been admonished of trials and dangers, and may not promise himself exemption from them : he has been also assured of succor and support. In a word, for all the evil in his lot, he has some more than countervailing good ; his sorrows are as nothing to his joys ; he has a present happiness, which, with all its abatements, he would not exchange for any conceivable amount of enjoyment in this world's gift. The idea at variance with this, so prevalent among men, has no countenance, then, from the Scriptures, correctly understood and explained.

6. We shall present briefly but one topic more. The joys of the believer in Christ would never have been so much suspected by the world, had they been properly exemplified by those to whom the world looks as illustrations of the effect of the gospel. This responsibility now has most unhappily rested, sometimes, where it has been wholly betrayed, and still oftener, where it has been sustained in a most imperfect manner. It has been, we say, sometimes wholly betrayed. Some, who have borne for a time the name of Christians, have afterwards renounced it ; and returned again to the world, from which, in fact, they never separated, except in appearance. Others again, a much more numerous class, without forfeiting their rank as Christians, have been seen to shrink, with manifest reluctance, from the yoke which their Master would impose upon them, and to cast a still wishful, longing eye towards the objects and pleasures which they are required to abandon. We cannot wonder that the irreligious, who witness such conduct, should conclude from it, that it must surely be an irksome service, which those who may be presumed to know it best, are so ready either to forsake altogether, or, by unauthorized liberties, accommodate to their freer inclinations.

But in thus allowing the foregoing inference to be natural, we do not concede its truth. The imputation which it casts upon religion is most unfounded, surely, so far as it rests upon the apostasy of those who for a while deceive themselves, or the church, or both ; for, unless treachery in religion proves more than treachery in other cases, it is no proof of any thing but the baseness of the

traitor himself; it brings no just suspicion upon the goodness of the cause which he renounces. Nor has the idea, that Christianity is a gloomy system, any better foundation, as regards the conduct of the other class of professors—those, we mean, who are so reluctant to part with their earthly joys, and throw themselves for happiness upon the resources of the gospel. We need not doubt the sufficiency of those resources, to find a reason for their resorting thus to other means of enjoyment. It is not that they cannot be happy in the service of God, that they are driven to the world for comfort. It is because they refuse to give up the world, and be content with Christ as their portion, that he is compelled to withhold from them the blessedness, which he bestows only on the obedient and faithful. To secure the full rewards of piety, we must fulfil the conditions which it prescribes. It can hardly be said, perhaps, that we secure the former in *proportion* to our performance of the latter; for, if this fall greatly short of the requirement, and yet not so far short of it as to impair essentially the activity of conscience, the result is, that we relish less, than when we were in a state of carelessness, those pleasures of sin which we are unwilling to forego, while this reserve itself disqualifies us for deriving much happiness even from such duties as we may perform. If we would be happy in religion, we must be so, not upon our own terms, but those which God has established. If men have overlooked and neglected this principle, and thus failed to realize their unauthorized expectations in regard to the present benefits and joys of religion, it is not religion, as every one must see, which should be reproached with this, but their own inconsistency and unfaithfulness.

Although we have by no means exhausted the subject, we must here arrest our remarks. There are yet other ways in which piety has fallen under suspicion, in the matter of which we have been speaking; and did our limits permit, we might take up these, and show that they also are as far from justifying this suspicion, as the various sources of it which have now been pointed out. Any one, who will institute a similar course of inquiry in respect to them, will come to the same conclusion; and that is, that men, in all these cases, attribute to religion something which does not belong to it, or leave out of the



account something which does, and thus misjudge and misrepresent its tendency.

The subject before us is one of vast practical moment, and we are sensible, that, in our discussion of it, we have done it very imperfect justice. Would that it might receive, especially from the young, who have not yet consecrated their vigor to God, the attention which it deserves. Of all others, they, as we said at the beginning, are specially prone to entertain the error which we have been laboring to expose. Could we gain the ear of such, we would say to them,—Be not deceived. The gloomy associations, which you connect with a life of devotion to the service of your Creator, are not more dishonorable to Him, than they are injurious to yourselves. In yielding to the influence of them and preferring the world to heaven, you are not only giving up the only substantial happiness which is suited to your spiritual, immortal nature, but are pursuing phantoms which you can never overtake, which will mock and elude your grasp for ever. We know, indeed, the causes which have betrayed you into this error; but we know, too, that they are insufficient to excuse and justify it. You have felt that repugnance of the heart to the duties of religion, so natural to every heart while as yet unrenewed;—you have witnessed, in the case of others, the distressing effects of the heart's first endeavors to overcome this repugnance;—you have marked the contrast, apparent in their whole aspect and demeanor, between the self-conscious heir of immortality and the thoughtless child of mirth;—you have read in the Scriptures and elsewhere, that conflicts and sorrows enter into the Christian's experience; and for these reasons, and because, furthermore, you have met so seldom with living witnesses for its truth, you have been accustomed to look with utter distrust upon God's saying, that "wisdom's ways are ways of pleasantness and all her paths are peace." Those paths, on the contrary, seem to you full of every thing that is gloomy and forbidding. But we pray you to cast yet one more look at them, as they appear in the light of the explanations which we have been offering to you. You see that the reasons, which have led you to think so unworthily of the divine requirements, are all imaginary. You perceive that every single circumstance, affording so much as the color of justice for your suspicions, may be so explained as to take away this reproach of religion alto-

gether. And if this be true, then with what an irresistible voice does piety urge upon you its claims! If in sober truth it should be accounted madness to resist them, even supposing we could gain heaven only by being wretched till we arrive there, O, what shall we account it to resist them, when submitting to them would bring heaven into the soul even here upon earth! To this glorious issue Christianity has committed herself, if we will but hear her voice and do faithfully her bidding. Of the certainty of this you may not doubt,—you have every confirmation of it which fact as well as promise can furnish; since thousands and thousands of those now living and of those who have lived, have tested this power of the gospel to make them happy, and have set to it the seal of their experience. O cease, then, to think of the Saviour as *your* enemy, because he is the enemy of your *sins*! Behold in that enmity itself the strongest proof of his love for you. His easy yoke he would impose upon you, that he may break from your neck the worse than iron bondage which is now oppressing you. He would have you bear his burden, for no other reason than that you may “labor and be heavy laden” no more. H.

---

#### ARTICLE V.

##### EARLY MOHAMMEDAN HISTORY.

It was about the commencement of the seventh century that the genius and fortune of Mohammed laid the foundation of the stupendous system of imposture which bears his name. Though sprung from the stock of the Koreish, one of the most considerable Arabian tribes, and the hereditary guardians of the Kaaba or holy temple of Mecca, yet, when he first assumed the prophetic office, the only means which it was in his power to employ for the establishment of his claims were *the arts of persuasion*. Nature had not been illiberal in her gifts to the pretended prophet. He was distinguished by special beauty of person, majesty of mien, and a conciliatory address. These endowments were turned to account by him, particularly

in the commencement of this career. In a few years the people of Mecca were divided into two factions; the one recognizing and supporting Mohammed's pretensions, the other violently and virulently opposing them. The latter party, however, was by far the most numerous and powerful; and its leaders, by their secret machinations and by public attacks, succeeded in exciting such a general commotion in the city, that the life of Mohammed was no longer secure within its walls. In order to avoid the peril he had incurred, he was compelled (A. D. 622) to flee from Mecca to Yathreb (now Medina), accompanied by but a single friend.\* Many of the inhabitants of Medina had already been converted through the exertions of a few of their fellow-citizens, who, on occasion of a pilgrimage to Mecca, had listened with believing hearts to the preaching of Mohammed. These converts received him with open arms, and evinced a superstitious veneration of his person which almost tasks the power of credence. The water in which he had performed his ablutions, the parings of his nails, his very spittle, were carefully hoarded as consecrated relics.

Mohammed had hitherto appeared content with the sacerdotal dignity; but he now assumed in addition the exercise of regal functions. Henceforth his affairs wore a constantly brightening aspect. His authority acquired more efficient aid than the slow and uncertain process of persuasion. When his power was competent to enable him to use the sword with probable success, the sword instantly became his favorite means of making proselytes. He was not willing that his followers should be left to deduce the propriety of its use simply from his own example. By the religious sanction of the Koran he inculcated the belief that war against unbelievers was the most meritorious act of obedience to God, and would "cover a multitude of sins." His words in one passage are, "A drop of blood shed in the cause of God, a night spent in arms, is of more avail than two months of fasting or prayer." Under the name of zeal in the cause of religion, the wildest and most ruthless passions of the human heart were permitted to find ready, unrestricted

---

\* This was the celebrated Hejra or Flight, which constitutes the Mohammedan era. It took place on Friday, July 16th. The city Yathreb to which this flight was directed, was thenceforward denominated *Medina*, or *THE CITY, par excellence*.

vent. Predatory warfare, even when successful, had hitherto afforded the barbarous hordes of Arabia no other recompense than the acquisition of booty or the satisfaction of revenge, under the incumbrance, frequently, of restless remorse in the recollection of inhuman deeds. The religion of Mohammed promised its votaries ineffable and unending bliss in another world, as the certain lot of him who, in behalf of that religion, should give free course to ferocious passions which before had been checked only by dim and dubious apprehensions of supernatural retribution. It cannot be questioned, that this peculiar and strongly marked feature in the Mohammedan religion was the principal source of its surprising success. The alternative presented to the tribes of Arabia was, on the one hand, the profession of Islamism, with the privilege of fighting and plundering the whole infidel world, under, not merely the permission, but the smiles, of their God; and, on the other, rejection of the proffered faith, and exposure to the furious religious zeal of their more pliant neighbors. The presentation of such an alternative speedily wrought a revolution in the national faith of Arabia. The gross idolatry of former days was abandoned, and the two simple articles of belief to which Mohammed demanded assent were substituted in its stead. Before the death of Mohammed, the professed creed of every province of Arabia, with but a single exception, was, "There is only one God, and Mahomet is the apostle of God;" the former proposition being, as Gibbon remarks, "an eternal truth, and the latter a necessary fiction." The exception which we have mentioned was the province of Yamama. There Moseilama erected his standard and attempted to sustain rival pretensions to the prophetic office. His formidable power continued till sometime after the commencement of the first caliphate, when a decisive battle effected its destruction.

Mohammed fought personally in several battles, and numerous enterprises were undertaken by his lieutenants under his direction, during the ten years that intervened between his flight to Medina and his decease. He even projected the invasion and complete reduction of Syria. This country had long owned the supremacy of the Roman emperors, whose throne was then occupied by Heraclius. Mohammed himself proceeded, at the head of



an army of thirty thousand men, almost to Damascus, and, by his victories and the terror of his name, obtained the submission of the population of Syria, from the Euphrates to the Red Sea; but, from some cause not definitely ascertained (perhaps a famine among the troops, which was the more intolerable on account of a long-continued drought), a council of war decided that the enterprise should be abandoned in this stage of its progress, before measures had been taken to secure the permanence of the acquisition already made. The country, it is probable, immediately resumed its old allegiance to the Roman empire.

Mohammed died, in his own opinion, under the operation of poison administered to him, from a motive of revenge, by a Jewish woman. At his decease (June 7th, A. D. 632), the tribes of Arabia threw off the yoke that they had worn, and refused to acknowledge the authority of the Caliph Abubeker.\* The Caliph even found his sway restricted to the cities of Mecca, Medina and Tayef. But the vigorous measures of his warlike general, Caled, surnamed the Sword of God, soon reclaimed the rebellious to obedience. The most formidable resistance to the Caliph's authority which Caled encountered in the progress of his arms, was made by the adherents to the false prophet Moseilama. In the first onset the army of Caled suffered a severe defeat, with the loss of a thousand men; but in a subsequent battle, Moseilama himself, with ten thousand of his followers, fell before the victorious Mohammedans. This event established the dominion of Abubeker in Arabia; and he now turned his thoughts to foreign conquest. An expedition to Syria was very early undertaken. The Caliph despatched a circular letter to the various Arabian tribes, which was couched in the following terms: "This is to acquaint you that I purpose sending true believers into Syria, to take it from the hands of the infidels; and I would have you remember that to fight for religion is to obey God." A vast army was speedily collected. Its command was given to Abu Obidah, while Caled, who had shown in former enterprises

---

\* The word *Caliph*, as is commonly known, signifies *vicar* or substitute. *Abubeker* signifies *father of the virgin*, and, according to D'Herbelot (*Bibl. Orient.*, art. *Abubeer*), the name was given to the Caliph because his daughter was the only one of Mohammed's wives who was not a widow.

that his military genius fitted him to be the chief leader of the Saracens, was content to serve in an inferior station under the banner of his faith. Bozra soon yielded to the spirited attack of the Moslems; and the victorious forces proceeded to the investment of Damascus, the capital of Syria. At this juncture, the Emperor Heraclius, aroused by the danger of losing an extensive and valuable province, and aware that the growing power of the Saracens would soon, if unchecked, menace the security of his throne, hastily assembled an army of seventy thousand men at Emesa and despatched it for the relief of Damascus. The tidings that an imperial army was approaching caused a suspension of the siege; and the Saracens advanced to encounter their enemies. The two parties met on the plain of Aiznadin. Their conflict was terribly disastrous to the forces of the Emperor, which were nearly annihilated. The feeble remnant took refuge in the neighboring cities. Returning to Damascus, the Saracens resumed the siege of the city, and at last it was forced to surrender. The fate of the capital was in no very long time the fate of all Syria. When the siege of Jerusalem had been prosecuted for four months, the patriarch Sophronius offered to deliver up the city to the Saracens, making, however, the singular stipulation, that the Caliph should be present in person to ratify the articles of surrender. This demand was conceded; and the Caliph travelled from Medina, and entered the Holy City in the guise of an ordinary pilgrim. Jerusalem was yielded up to him, and on the ruins of the temple of Solomon a Mohammedan mosque was soon erected, which is now termed the mosque of Omar. The conquest of Aleppo and Antioch followed. The victorious Moslems pressed onward to the north, passed Mount Taurus, subjecting the province of Cilicia to their arms, and advanced even to the vicinity of Constantinople. The Euphrates and Tigris were the boundaries of their conquests on the East. To the West, the whole coast of the Mediterranean acknowledged their sway, with the exception merely of an unimportant fortress; and a fleet was even equipped and despatched to ravage the neighboring isles of the sea.

Many years elapsed, however, after the first invasion of Syria by command of Abubeker, before its reduction became thus complete. Omar had, during this time, suc-

ceeded to the caliphate, and it was he to whom Jerusalem was surrendered.

Meanwhile the conquest of Persia and of Egypt had been commenced. So early as the first year of the caliphate of Abubeker, the warlike Caled, at the command of his sovereign, advanced into Persia with a large army and speedily wrested several cities from the hands of their terror-stricken governors. Though Caled was soon recalled to take part in the Syrian war, his successors in the conduct of the invasion of Persia eventually effected the reduction of the greater part of that vast empire. The Saracens gained an important battle on the plains of Cadesia, besieged and sacked Madain (the ancient Ctesiphon), in a few years advanced as far as the valley of Istachar or Persepolis, and finally drove Yesdegerd, the unfortunate sovereign of Persia, to the verge of the Chinese dominions. When Othman succeeded Omar in the possession of the caliphate, he promised the government of the extensive country of Khorasan to the general who should subdue it to obedience. In the musical and elegant language of Gibbon, "The condition was accepted; the prize was deserved. The standard of Mahomet was planted on the walls of Herat, Merou, and Balch; and the successful leader neither halted nor reposed, till his foaming cavalry had tasted the waters of the Oxus." Many years afterward (A. D. 710), Transoxiana itself fell before the arms of the governors of Khorasan, and was long subject to their sway.

Under the caliphate of Omar (A. D. 634—44), the conquest of Egypt was achieved by Amrou, one of his generals. As he entered that country, the Copts voluntarily surrendered themselves to his protection. They belonged to the sect of Christians called Jacobites, and, in common with their brethren throughout the East, had been persecuted in every possible way by Eastern Emperors, as heretics. By the payment of a considerable tribute to Amrou, they purchased emancipation from the galling tyranny of the Greeks. The Grecian troops of Heraclius, with the Melchites\* of Egypt, retreated before the Sara-

---

\* This name is derived from a word belonging to several oriental languages, which signifies *king*. The Melchites (adherents to the king or emperor) adopted the creed of the Greek church and the decisions of the council of Chalcedon. The Copts or Jacobites rejected both.

cens; and Amrou advanced to besiege Alexandria. After a protracted and laborious investment, the capital of Egypt yielded to his constancy (Dec. 22d, A. D. 640), and the event decided the fate of the whole country.

When Amrou had completed this important conquest, he was recalled home by the jealousy of the Caliph Omar; and, if we may decide from his future conduct, his sovereign's jealousy was far from being baseless. Amrou subsequently espoused with ardor and activity the cause of Moawiyah, who wrested the caliphate from the hands of the legitimate successors of Mohammed and usurped it for himself and his children. This course may, however, have been prompted solely by the desire of revenge for his supposed wrongs; and his fidelity may have been unsullied before the ignominy of recall was inflicted.

Omar was assassinated by a slave (Nov. 6, A. D. 644), whose petition against his master he had treated with neglect. It was he who first assumed the title of *Emir al Moumenin*, or commander of the faithful, so commonly adopted by his successors in the caliphate. This was the heroic age of the Moslems.

Othman succeeded Omar. It was in his reign, as has before been mentioned incidentally, that Khorasan was conquered and its government conferred upon the successful invader. By the command of this Caliph, Abdallah, his foster-brother, traversed the desert of Barca with a large army, ravaged all the northern coast of Africa to the shores of the Atlantic ocean, and, if Arabian authors are to be trusted, even penetrated into Andalusia or Spain. But, at any rate, these western conquests were not permanently secured till a much later date. Moreover, Said, the Saracen viceroy of Egypt, forced his way southward into Nubia, and compelled the sovereign of that country to send him an annual tribute of a large number of black slaves, who afterwards formed a very important item in Arabian grandeur. The same enterprising governor also equipped in the ports of Syria and Egypt a powerful fleet, which succeeded in taking possession of Cyprus and other isles of the Mediterranean.

Othman, at the age of 82, fell a victim to the spirit of insubordination which his weak temper had suffered to extend itself in the provinces of Arabia. The malcontents marched in a body to Medina, and demanded that the Caliph should execute justice or descend from the throne. Not satisfied



with their sovereign's answer, they commenced a siege of the city, and at the end of six weeks forced an entrance. Othman was assassinated, being pierced by a multitude of wounds while intently perusing the Koran.

Ali, the son-in-law of Mohammed, after an unjust exclusion of twenty-three years, succeeded Othman in the caliphate. His accession and policy quieted for a time the disturbed condition of the kingdom. But this quiet gave place before long to more alarming sedition. The first movements of dissatisfaction were, however, quieted. Telha and Zobeir, two powerful Arabian chiefs, who were the leaders of the insurgents, were defeated and slain. But a party of still greater consequence soon elevated itself against the throne of the Caliph. When the religion of Mohammed was in the infancy of its progress, and was obliged to struggle against the strenuous opposition of the inhabitants of Mecca, Abu Sophian, chief of the family of Ommyah, possessed the Meccan principality and headed the exertions which were made to crush the innovation. When, however, Mecca was forced to surrender to the increased power of Mohammed, Abu Sophian, as he delivered the keys of the city into the hands of the pretended prophet, confessed the divinity of his claims and enlisted himself in the ranks of his followers. It was Moawiyah, the son of Abu Sophian, who now raised the standard of rebellion against Ali, the legitimate successor of the prophet. The government of Syria had been entrusted in his charge. Cilicia and the islands of Crete and Rhodes were conquered by his valor; and, on occasion of some supposed or pretended injury received by the Saracens from the Roman Emperor, he even attacked a Roman fleet in the Mediterranean and came off victorious. He became too great for a subject, and dared to contend with Ali for the supremacy. Moawiyah collected a formidable army from his own province of Syria and from Egypt (whose governor espoused his cause), and marched against his sovereign. In the plains of Siffin the hostile forces contended with varying success one hundred and ten days. To end such a fruitless waste of human life the point of dispute was referred to Abu Musa and Amrou as umpires, but with partial success, and the succession was not fully settled till Ali's life was destroyed by an assassin in the city of Cufa, which he had

made the seat of his government and to which he had retired. Three zealots had agreed together that one of them should assassinate Ali, another Moawiyah, and the third Amrou, in order to deliver the empire from the turmoil and bloodshed which were occasioned by their rival schemes. Only one was successful in his design; and that one (whose name was Abdalrahman) had chosen Ali as his victim.

When Ali was dead, Moawiyah, after purchasing the abdication of Hassan, Ali's eldest son, succeeded without further opposition to the throne of the Caliphs (A. D. 660). The dynasty which he founded is termed the dynasty of the Ommiades, which was the name of the family from which he sprang. He transferred the seat of government from Cufa to Damascus in Syria. Yezid, his son and successor, pursued the family of Ali with much rigor. They were solemnly excommunicated, from the tops of the mosques, and were banished to Medina to spend their lives in services of devotion at the tomb of Mohammed.

The pretensions of Ali, the husband of Mohammed's daughter Fatima, have been the subject of severe contention among the Mohammedans. The two grand sects into which they are divided are distinguished by widely different views as to this topic. The Sonnites,\* who claim to be the orthodox sect, believe Ali to have been inferior, in point of sanctity, to the three preceding Caliphs, Abubeker, Omar, and Othman; while the Shiites (*i. e.*, *heretics*) or sectaries of Ali, maintain that Ali was the first rightful Caliph, those who preceded him being usurpers, and, moreover, that his sanctity was far superior to that of any previous or subsequent successor to the throne of Mohammed. The Shiites have enriched, with an additional clause, the creed which Mohammed presented to his adherents. Upon repeating, "There is only one God, and Mohammed is the apostle of God," they scrupulously subjoin, "and Ali is the vicar of Mohammed." Some of this sect even hold that Ali is on an equality with Mohammed, although by most this opinion is regarded as impious. A political occasion gave rise to a variance which soon extended itself to many other points besides the comparative rank of Ali, and

---

\* This term is derived from *Sonna*, a collection of traditions, and designates those who hold the traditions as of equal authority with the Koran.

gradually reached a very high pitch of animosity. The Sonnites and the Shiites mutually charged each other with corrupting the Koran and neglecting its precepts. The Sonnites consider the Sonna to be of divine authority; while by the Shiites it is rejected and vilified. The Shiites commence their ablutions at the wrist and proceed downwards; while the Sonnites begin with the tips of the fingers and proceed upwards. In short, their reciprocal enmity is so zealous, that each party stigmatizes the other as apostate, and further from the truth than either Jew or Christian. The Persians early espoused the cause of the Shiites. The Fatimite dynasty of sovereigns in Egypt, with the Edrissite and other dynasties of Africa, all of which claimed a doubtful descent from Ali and Fatima, were all, naturally enough, of the sect of the Shiites. The Abassides, who supplanted the Ommiades in the caliphate, were followers of Ali. At the present day, the Persians, many of the Usbek princes of Tartary, and some of the Mohammedan princes in India, are Shiites; while the Turks are, almost without exception, Sonnites. So virulent is the enmity between these two sects that, according to the testimony of recent travellers, if a Shiite travels into Turkey, or a Sonnite into Persia, he is obliged, however unwillingly, to conform to the customs of the country in his devotions, in order that he may avoid being torn in pieces by the populace. A magnificent mosque is erected to Ali, in a place called Meshed Ali, not far from the ruins of Cufa. Its dome is of brass, thickly plated with gold. To this mosque pilgrimages are made by the Shiites of all countries, as they are made to Mecca by all sects of Mohammedans. About the middle of the last century, the sect of the Shiites came near being extirpated. When the famous Nadir Shah ascended the throne of Persia, he desired to close the breach between the Sonnites and the Shiites, and, for this purpose, proposed to the latter a change of name. He wished them to adopt the appellation *Djafarites*, from the name of an Imam highly venerated by both sects. Though the authority of Nadir Shah caused some to evince compliance with the requirement, yet the great body of the Shiites withstood the innovation. Nadir Shah endeavored to overcome their contumacy by every species of persecution, but in vain.

Religious zeal was inflexible, and even exulted at the prospect of reward for endurance of temporal evils in the cause of God. This unwelcome interference in matters of religion cost the Persian sovereign his life. He was assassinated in his tent; and this event restored the Shiites to their wonted condition in Persia.

The reign of Yezid, the second of the Ommiades dynasty, was marked by an important rebellion. Not long after he succeeded his father Moawiyah, the caliphate was claimed by Abdallah, the son of Zobeir. Abdallah was a cousin of Mohammed, Zobeir being one of the prophet's ten uncles; and all Arabia rose in arms to support his pretensions. He was formally proclaimed Caliph in Mecca and Medina, and his power outlasted the repeated efforts which Yezid and the two next Syrian Caliphs made to suppress it. Abdalmalek, son of Merwan, on his accession to the throne, sent an army into Arabia which defeated Abdallah and restored the country to the sway of the Ommiades. Peace prevailing throughout the dominions of Abdalmalek, he turned his attention to the conquest of Africa, which the listless indifference or the weakness of his predecessors had suffered, almost quietly, to resume its ancient independence. The Caliph Moawiyah had indeed made some inconsiderable attempts to regain the former authority of the Saracens in that country; but the subsequent commotions in his empire caused an abandonment of the design, and did not permit its resumption till the accession of Abdalmalek. The conduct of the expedition was committed to Hassan, governor of Egypt; and he acquitted himself creditably of his important trust. Carthage, the metropolis of Africa, first yielded to his arms; and the flames of a conflagration, lit up by the conquerors, almost annihilated the little that remained of its pristine splendor. Henceforth the invaders encountered no very considerable opposition in their progress. The Moors eventually adopted the religion and language of the Saracens, and by degrees commingled with them, conquerors and conquered forming one homogeneous people.

The restless spirit of Musa, successor of Hassan in the government of Africa, prompted him to pass the straits of Gibraltar and try his prowess against the hardy conquerors of Spain. The Goths and the Saracens, both orig-



inally issuing from Asia, had both pressed westward, with resistless force, through different quarters of the globe, the former traversing the fertile countries of Europe and the latter the desert plains of Africa; and they now met, at the height of their victorious career, upon the extreme confines of their respective conquests. Assisted by the treachery of a Gothic general, whose resentment had been inflamed by injuries received at the hand of his sovereign, Musa obtained firm footing in Spain. He gradually pushed his arms northward, and at last drove the Goths beyond the the Pyrenees into the Gallic provinces. He even prepared to pass these mountains with a powerful armament (to use the language of Gibbon), "to extinguish in Gaul and Italy the declining kingdoms of the Franks and Lombards, and to preach the unity of God on the altar of the Vatican. From thence, subduing the barbarians of Germany, he proposed to follow the course of the Danube from its source to the Euxine sea, and to overthrow the Greek or Roman empire of Constantinople, and, returning from Europe to Asia, to unite his new acquisitions with Antioch and the provinces of Syria." The attempt to execute this mighty enterprise was prevented by the recall of Musa to the court of the Caliph of Damascus. Walid had succeeded Abdalmalek in the caliphate, and was then lying upon his death-bed. Soliman, his brother and successor, treated Musa with indignity and cruelty; and the conqueror of Spain died at Mecca under the pressure of calamity.

While Musa was achieving victories over the Goths, another lieutenant of the Caliph Walid added to the empire the vast province of Transoxiana. A third army marched through the provinces of Asia Minor almost to Constantinople. The Emperor Justinian sent a large force against the Saracens, but it suffered a shameful defeat. The conquerors besieged and took several important fortresses in the vicinity of Constantinople, but did not venture to attack the city. Under the caliphate of Soliman, however, a large armament was equipped on sea and land, and the Byzantine capital itself was invested (A. D. 716). Moslemah, who commanded the forces which passed across the Hellespont from Asia to Europe and assailed Constantinople upon the land side, met with considerable success, and confidently looked forward to

a prosperous issue of the siege. But his expectations were frustrated. The vast naval force which had been fitted out in the ports of Syria, and Egypt, was attacked by the Greek fire-ships, as it sailed up the straits to the harbor of Constantinople, and utterly annihilated. The celebrated *Greek fire*, a novel instrument of warfare to the Saracens, and the composition of which is to this day involved in much obscurity, was the chief cause of their terrible defeat. It was discharged, by means of arrows and javelins or from metallic tubes, against the ships of the enemy; and if once it fastened itself upon any vessel, its destruction was nearly inevitable. Water, instead of extinguishing, is said to have aggravated the flames. The secret of compounding this strange material was for a long time confined to the Greeks; but it was eventually discovered by the Saracens, and employed against the Christians during the (so called) holy wars of Syria and Egypt.

During the decline of the monarchy of France, its divisions and weakness prompted the Saracens of Spain to pass the Pyrenees and attempt its subjugation (A. D. 731). The enterprise was commenced by Ahdalrahman, with a numerous army. He ravaged the southern provinces of France, and proceeded northward as far as the bank of the Loire. Here, however, his progress was stopped. Charles Martel, the legitimate son of Pepin Heristel, collected a large force and advanced to repel the intruders. He encountered the Saracens upon the plain between Tours and Poitiers, and defeated them with tremendous slaughter. The victory was final. The invaders made no further efforts to retain their footing in France, but retreated beyond the Pyrenees, and never resumed their enterprise.

The Caliph Merwan\* the seventh from Soliman was the last of the dynasty of the Ommiades (A. D. 746—50). That race had never been regarded by all the subjects of the empire as legitimate possessors of the throne. The descendants of Abbas, an uncle of Mohammed, aspired to supplant

---

\* He was surnamed *al Hemar*, which usually signifies *the ass*. This is the meaning ascribed to it by Gibbon, and after him other writers. It is difficult, however, notwithstanding all that may be said of the peculiarity of eastern nations, to believe that the Caliph would have rejoiced in such an appellation. Abulpharagius states, more plausibly, that it was applied to him from the name of a flower which was his favorite. (*Chronicon Syriacum*, p. 125.) His six predecessors were insignificant men, and reigned in all only about thirty years.

them, and succeeded in the attempt. The Persians, as followers of Ali, warmly espoused the cause of the Abassides, who were nearly related to the family of Ali; gladly taking arms against the Ommiades, who were descendants of Abu Sophian, first the inveterate enemy, afterward the doubtful friend, of Mohammed. Abul Abbas, surnamed Abdallah, overcame Merwan in a pitched battle near the river Zab, and ascended the throne. He transferred the seat of government from Damascus back to Cufa, where it had been established by Ali. Abul Abbas subsequently built Hashemiah and made it his capital. His brother, surnamed Almansor, the second of the Abassidan dynasty of Caliphs, built Bagdad, so famous in the tales of the East, and this city was the imperial seat so long as the dominion of the Caliphs endured.

The Abassides did not succeed to undivided possession of the empire. Abdalrahman, a youth of the family of the Ommiades, fled to Spain, in order to escape the rancor of the new family of Caliphs. The Saracens of that country saluted him as their lawful sovereign; and he established an independent dynasty upon the throne of Cordova.\*

Haroun al Raschid, the fifth Caliph of the line of the Abassides, sent Ibrahim ben Aglab to govern in his name a part of his African dominions. He, however, threw off his allegiance to the throne of Bagdad, conquered a great extent of country (including the island of Sicily, which was taken from the French), and left his possessions to his successors, who, from him, were denominated Aglabites. The kingdom which they ruled, reached from Egypt on the east to Tunis on the west. It fell before the power of the Fatimites, in the year 296 of the Hejra, somewhat more than a century after its rise.

About this time the African dynasty of the Edrissites maintained an existence independent of the Caliphs of Bagdad. This family took its name from Edris, the son

---

\* The subsequent history of the Moors in Spain may as well be briefly related in a note. The last of the Ommiades was murdered in 1038, A. D. The government then fell in pieces, and different (so called) kings reigned in Saragossa, Valencia, and Seville. These divisions favored the attempts of the Christians to regain the country and in a short time only the territory of Granada remained in the possession of the Moors. The family reigning over this remnant of the once independent and splendid caliphate of Spain, were called the Almoravides. Another dynasty, called the Almohades, supplanted the Almoravides. During their reign the territory of Granada was conquered by Ferdinand and Isabella, and the Moors were driven out of Spain.

of Abdallah, who was a descendant of Ali, the son-in-law of Mohammed. Its dominion comprehended Barbary, Fez, Ceuta, and Tangier. These countries were subjugated, and the family of the Edrissites was nearly exterminated by the army of the Fatimites.

Thus all the western possessions of the Ommiades, except the countries of Egypt and Syria, disowned the authority of the Abassides. It was under the last of the Ommiades that the empire of the Caliphs was at its height in point of extent. It then reached from the confines of Tartary and India to those of the Atlantic ocean. In the forcible words of Gibbon, "The language and laws of the Koran were studied with equal devotion at Samarcand and Seville; the Moor and the Indian embraced as countrymen and brothers in the pilgrimage of Mecca; and the Arabian language was adopted as the popular idiom in all the provinces to the westward of the Tigris." But the talents and energy of the succeeding dynasty of Caliphs were unequal to the task of preserving the bond of union between nations so distant and so different from each other; and at its accession the empire commenced its wane.\*

The only enterprises of importance which were undertaken by the first Caliphs of the Abassidan dynasty were a triumphant expedition against the Greeks, which was directed by Haroun al Raschid, the fourth of the race, and the reduction of Sicily and Crete by command of the Caliph Almamon. Motassem, the eighth of the Abassides, was the last whose reign retained any of the lustre of former days. He was the first who introduced into the provinces and into Bagdad itself large bodies of Turks, whom he purchased as slaves, and, after educating them to the military life, employed them as his body guards. This step was the ruin of the kingdom. The power possessed by these foreign mercenaries was dangerous to the Caliphs, and was soon employed in dethroning them and setting them up as caprice or partiality dictated. The son of Motassem was cut in pieces by his Turkish guards, and his successor upon the precarious throne

---

\* Though Mohammedan countries are not now under one common secular sway, yet the Koran exercises a more extensive dominion than it did even in the most prosperous condition of the caliphate. Since its authority was destroyed in Spain, it has been extended over the kingdoms of Visapour and Golconda in India, the islands of Cyprus, Rhodes, and the Cyclades, and parts of Tartary, Hungary, and Greece.



purchased continuance in the station only by repeated acts of cringing submission to the will of his masters. The military slaves for some time maintained absolute power; but it was at last partially restrained, though by no means crushed, through the policy of wiser Caliphs.

About the commencement of the tenth century arose the sect of the Carmathians, whose career long threatened the existence of the caliphate of Bagdad. Its founder, Carmath, made his appearance in the neighborhood of Cufa, promulgating doctrines which, though ostensibly based on the Koran, were deeply tinged with an unintelligible mysticism. He met with considerable success. At his death he appointed twelve apostles, who dispersed themselves throughout Arabia, and, by their preaching, gained over a formidable body of adherents. They professed to abhor the degenerate luxury of the court of Bagdad, whose habits they set in forcible contrast with the frugal and unpretending simplicity of the first Caliphs. In time they acquired sufficient strength to make head against their sovereigns, and for two centuries kept them in continual fear, defeating their armies, ravaging their provinces, and storming their cities. Abu Taher even crossed the deserts of Arabia, at the head of a large body of Carmathians, and attacked the holy city; put thirty thousand citizens and pilgrims to the sword; and carried off in triumph the black stone of the Caaba. The stone was subsequently restored to the temple of Mecca, and the horror which the sacrilegious outrage had excited gradually died away.

It was at this period (A. D. 908) that the famous dynasty of the Fatimites commenced its career in Africa. At Segelmessa, a city in the western part of Africa, a pretended prophet started up and soon acquired a considerable party of followers. His name was Abou Mohammed Obeidallah. He laid claim, whether rightfully or not is doubtful, to a legitimate descent from Ali and Fatima, the son-in-law and the daughter of Mohammed. In time he extended his pretensions from religious to political authority; and established at Segelmessa the throne of a dynasty which was to be a powerful and dangerous rival of the dynasty of the Abassides. He expelled the neighboring dynasties of the Aglabites and Edrissites from the countries which they possessed, and added them to his

own dominions. His sons succeeded to his empire and augmented it by new conquests. He removed his residence from Segelmessa to Cairoan. Moez Ledinillah, fourth of the Fatimite line, carried his army eastward into Egypt, subdued that country to his sway and founded Cairo, henceforth the capital. He there, by virtue of his alleged descent from Ali, assumed the title of Caliph; and the Caliph of Bagdad ceased to be recognized as in any sense the sovereign of Egypt. The Fatimite Caliph called himself *Mehedi*, or, director of the faithful, although this title had been reserved for the twelfth and last great Imam, who was not to appear till the end of the world. He inserted his own name in the public prayers, in place of that of the Abassidan Caliph.

The reality of the descent from Ali claimed by the Fatimites is reasonably questioned. When Thabateba asked Moez Ledinillah to what branch of the descendants of Ali he belonged, he fiercely answered, drawing his sword and pointing at it, "This is my genealogy," and, casting handfuls of gold to his soldiers, "This is one way to prove my race."

Thus, in the tenth century, there were three Caliphs, each claiming rightful supremacy, viz., at Bagdad, in Spain, and in Africa.

It was about this time that the family of the *Bowides* usurped dominion over the very central portions of the caliphate of Bagdad. The dynasty was founded by Ali (son of Bowiah), a native of Dilem, who was surnamed *Amadeddoulat*, or pillar of the state. He obtained possession of Persia, Persian Irak, Parthia and Kerman. When Ali invaded Persia, it was governed by Jacout, in the name of Caher, who was then Caliph of Bagdad. By command of the Caliph, Jacout led an army against Ali. He was unsuccessful. Radhi, the successor of Caher, made peace with Amadeddoulat, and formally created him Sultan of the dominions he had conquered. These dominions Amadeddoulat divided with his two brothers. Hassan had Persian Irak (residing at Ispahan), Ahmed had Kerman, and Amadeddoulat himself retained Persia, making Shiraz his seat of government. This was in the year 321 of the Hejra. The Bowides gained and long exercised a despotic control over the Caliphs of Bag-

dad, who were reduced by them to the mere performance of religious functions in the mosques, and were deposed at their pleasure. It is said that one Caliph was so degraded as to ask alms among blind men at the gate of one of the mosques in Bagdad. Radhi was dragged from his throne, deprived of his eyes, and thrust into a dungeon. This Caliph, says Abulfeda, was the last who deserved the title of commander of the faithful; the last who addressed the people or conversed with the learned; the last who in the expenditure of his household did no discredit to the wealth and magnificence of former Caliphs. The dynasty of the Bowides lasted till the year 448 of the Hejra, when it was merged in the power of the Seljuks.

Meanwhile, in the year 380 of the Hejra, the Fatimites obtained possession of Syria, which had been governed for fifty years by the family of the Akschidites or descendants of Akschid. The Fatimite Caliph Aziz subdued this country while Tai was Caliph of Bagdad. Aziz appointed Manasse, a Jew, the son of Kazor, to be its governor. The Fatimite sovereign even attempted to obtain possession of Aleppo.\*

The destruction of the power of the caliphate is attributed by Gibbon to the three following causes, the disorders of the Turkish guards, the rise and progress of the Carmathians, and the magnitude of the empire itself. The latter cause was a very important one. The pulsations of authority were too weak to operate upon so distant extremities. Under Radhi, the twentieth Caliph, the dominions of his predecessors were divided as follows. Persia was ruled by the Bowides; Mosul and Mesopotamia by the Hamadanites; Egypt and Syria by Akschid; Africa by the Fatimites; Spain by the Ommiades; Khorasan by the Samanides; Georgia and Thabarestan by the Dailemites; and Arabia by the Carmathians, to whom the Caliphs even paid tribute for the passage of pilgrims to Mecca.

---

\* Hakem, the son and immediate successor of Aziz, was a very singular personage. He prohibited all the women in Egypt from being seen abroad, or even looking from a door, a window, or a roof. His design in this and some other similar restrictions was professedly to diminish vice. He had one half of Cairo set on fire and the other half pillaged, for his amusement. At last he attempted to pass himself off as a divinity, and interdicted the pilgrimage to Mecca. The Jews and Christians were severely persecuted by him, and he enforced odious distinctions in dress between them and the Saracens. After despoiling the temple of the resurrection at Jerusalem, he entirely destroyed it. The Druses who, seventy thousand in number, inhabit the pachalick of Akka in Syria, are followers of Hakem. They believe him to have been an incarnation of the Deity. For a full and interesting account of these people, see "The Modern Traveller," Syria, Vol. I, p. 69. Amer. Ed.

In the former part of the eleventh century the Seljuk Turks rise into notice. They are so called from Seljuk, the son of a considerable emir of Turkestan. Seljuk was educated in the family of his sovereign, who regarded him with much affection. His independent spirit, however, awakened the fears of the queen, and she imparted them to the king in the hearing of the young emir. Observing his bold bearing before the king and herself, she said, "If this boy now uses so much freedom towards us, what will he not do when he shall have grown to be a man?" Hereupon Seljuk thought it advisable to leave Turkestan and, with many followers, passed the Jaxartes. He embraced the Mohammedan religion, and distinguished himself in warlike enterprises against the infidels. The manner in which he adopted his new religion was somewhat peculiar. On entering Persia and perceiving the prevalence of Mohammedanism, he assembled a council of his followers, and said to them, "Unless we take the faith of the inhabitants of this region which we have entered, we shall gain no adherents, but all will fight against us as infidels." A change of religion was resolved, and an orator was sent to the nearest city to beseech its governor that a learned man might come to them and instruct them how to worship God. The governor joyfully assented to their request; conversion was general among the Turks; and increasing importance and deference were benefits which they reaped from their policy. Seljuk left four sons, the eldest of whom, Michael, had two sons, Jaafar Bey, called Daoud, and Togrul Bey, called Mohammed.\*

In the days of these two latter princes the famous Mahmoud the Gaznevide sat on the throne of Eastern Persia. He was so powerful that the Turkmans did not venture to assail him. Togrul and Jaafar together ravaged Khorasan and even proceeded so far eastward as Armenia. Most of the petty princes of Armenia, through fear of the Seljuk Turks, surrendered their kingdoms into the hands of the Grecian Emperor, on condition of being supported against the invaders in the character of viceroys. But a tribe of Curds from the mountains attacked the

\* Bey is a Turkish word, signifying *lord*. Togrul, in Turkish, signifies *falcon*, according to D'Herbelot. (Bib. Oriental.) Daoud and Mohammed appear to have been Arabic designations, which were assumed in compliance with the usual custom of foreign converts to the Arabian religion. In many cases, however, no new name was taken on conversion, or else it was seldom or never employed.



Turkmans and put them to flight. They were even driven out of Aderbeijan or Media, and retired to Khorasan, where they recommenced their ravages. The Caliph of Bagdad, Cayem, sent an embassy to the leaders of the Turkmans, reproving them for making war upon their brethren in religious faith, and commanding them to desist. Jaafar Bey was disposed to slight the Caliph's requisition; but Togrul was inclined to a different policy, and overruled his brother's purpose of contempt. He made a formal reply to the Caliph, which professed obedience to his command, and which he subscribed, "Your humble slave and client, Togrul Bey, son of Michael."

The Seljuk Turks had incurred the hostility of Massoud, son and successor of Mahmoud the Gaznevide, by encroaching on his dominions. He at last marched against them in person with a very large army; but he was defeated. The Persian historian Ferishta celebrates the prodigious exploits of Massoud in this battle. (See Dow's Translation.) But all was in vain. The Seljuks conquered and obtained his dominions. They immediately elected Togrul as their king. The Gaznevites were wholly expelled from Persia and driven to the Indus. Nisabur became Togrul's seat of government.

Togrul exhibited excessive zeal in behalf of Mohammedanism. He professed great reverence for the Caliph of Bagdad, and took his part against the Fatimite Caliph his rival. Abulpharagius relates that Togrul despatched an ambassador to the Caliph Cayem, with this communication, "I am the slave of the head of the faithful. In all places over which I rule, I have instituted public prayers for the Caliph. I have not tyrannized over my subjects, as did Mahmoud and Massoud. It is plain, therefore, that I am not worse than they." The Caliph appointed Togrul his temporal viceregent. When the power of the Bowides became too sensible in the west of Persia and at Bagdad, the Caliph called Togrul to his deliverance. He obeyed and defeated the forces of the Bowides. The public entry of Togrul into Bagdad after his victory was a splendid ceremony.\* For the service he had rendered, or, more probably, from dread of his position, he was honored by the Caliph with the title of *Rocnoddin*, or

---

\* See Gibbon's account of it.

*support of religion*; he was recognized as the legitimate Sultan of his dominions; money was coined in his name at Bagdad; the Caliph married his sister; and in the public prayers his name was associated with that of the Caliph. He soon demanded the Caliph's daughter in marriage. This concession was refused and delayed for a long time, but was at last made from necessity. Shortly after the marriage was effected, Togrul died in the city of Rai, after having reigned twenty-six years. He left no children. His nephew Alp Arslan\* was his successor, and received from the Caliph the title of *Egredidin*, or *protector of religion*. Togrul's brother Jaafar, to whom he had left the government of Khorasan, had been sometime dead.†

About this period (A. D. 1070) there occurred a severe famine in Egypt. There were only three horses left in all Egypt, and those belonged to the Caliph. The rest, as well as the mules and asses, were eaten by their masters. A dog was sold for five dernarii. On one occasion, when a person of distinction descended from his mule and entered the palace of the Caliph, leaving the animal in the care of his servants, three men stole him from their hands, slew and ate him. The men were discovered and, by command of the Caliph, were crucified. In the night other men came, took the bodies from the crosses on which they hung, divided and ate them. At day-break the bones were found in a pile beneath the crosses, all the flesh being stripped from them. Abulpharagius, on whose authority these circumstances are related, states further that in one of the Egyptian cities, Tunis, which had contained three hundred thousand men, not one hundred remained when the famine ceased.

Alp Arslan effected the conquest of Georgia and Armenia, which countries, as has been before stated, had been surrendered by their governors into the hands of the Greeks. He even passed the Euphrates, and penetrated to Cæsarea, the capital of Cappadocia, which he besieged without success. His emirs pressed onward into Phrygia, committing wide ravages in their progress. In this province

\* This names signifies *conquering lion*.

† The character of the devastations made by the Turks in their warfare under Togrul and Jaafar, may be seen from the following sentence in Abulpharagius: "Propter multitudinem, diutius quam unam hebdomaden eas non ferebat ulla regio."

they were met by Diogenes Romanus, to whom the empress Eudocia had given her hand, that he might protect her dominions against the Turks. Diogenes was victorious. He drove his enemies beyond the Euphrates, and still advanced upon them. Alp Arslan became alarmed, and marched in person against the Emperor. A battle took place between Khelat and Melasgerd, in which the Romans were defeated (A. D. 1071). Diogenes was taken captive by a slave. Alp Arslan commanded that a regal tent should be prepared for his reception. The next day the Emperor was brought into his presence. "How would you have treated me," said the Turkish Sultan, "had the chances of war thrown me into your power?" The reply was, "As ill as I could; as enemies usually treat each other." The Sultan answered, "It is well; had you said otherwise I should not have believed you. What think you will be my treatment of you?" "One of three things," replied the Emperor, "You will either kill me, or carry me about in state through your dominions as a spectacle, or—but it is unnecessary that I should mention the third course, for it is idle to suppose that you will adopt it." Being pressed by the Sultan to state it, he said, "or, thirdly, you will send me back safely and honorably to my capital and bind me to you for ever as a brother." "It was my intention," said Alp Arslan, "to pursue this latter course, of which you despaired." A ransom was agreed, and Diogenes, after supping with the Sultan, was permitted to return to Constantinople. The two princes embraced at parting. When Diogenes reached Constantinople he found that the Greeks, in despair of his return, had made Michael emperor in his stead. Unable to oppose the new sway with any prospect of success, he retired to a monastery, after collecting the money for his ransom and transmitting it to Alp Arslan.

In the same year the Franks recovered Sicily from the possession of the Egyptian Caliph. The viceroy appointed by the Caliph treacherously surrendered the island, being bribed by a large sum of money.

Alp Arslan died the next year. He had appointed one of his sons governor of Carismia. Shams Melec, who had married a daughter of Alp Arslan, was Khan of Bokhara and other countries beyond the river Gihon. The two

neighboring princes, Alp Arslan's son and Shams Melec, quarrelled; and the latter thereupon treated his wife with the most atrocious cruelty, charging her with inciting her brother to lay waste his territories. He finally murdered her by trampling her under foot. When Alp Arslan heard of this event, he was fired with indignation, and levying ample forces, set forward to pass the river Gihon with the purpose of punishing the conduct of Shams Melec. The governor of a town in Carismia which resisted his progress was by some means taken captive, and when he was brought into the Sultan's presence, the latter ordered that he should be bound hand and foot and fastened to four stakes, and in that situation be slain by arrows. The Carismian, inflamed with passion at the prospect of so disgraceful a death, exclaimed, "Cowardly prince, that you are! Do you slay men like me in such a manner?" Warmed by the taunt, the Sultan commanded him to be set at liberty, and, as soon as his order was obeyed, discharged an arrow at him. The arrow, however, missed its destination, and the Carismian rushed upon the Sultan and wounded him in the thigh. A eunuch, rushing between them, received the further strokes intended for his master, and the desperado was speedily cut down by the guards. Not long after, however, the Sultan died of the wound inflicted on him. As if foreseeing his death, he had, before entering upon his expedition, designated his son Malek Shah as his successor.

The uncle, cousin, and brother of Malek Shah disputed his successorship to the crown; but they were all defeated. The Caliph Moctadi (the successor of Cayem, who died in 1070, A. D.) bestowed on Malek Shah the title of *Emir-al-moumenin*, which before the Caliphs had always reserved to themselves.

His uncle, Cutulmish, fled for safety into the Greek empire. Nicephorus Botoniates rebelled against the Emperor Michael VII, and induced Cutulmish to unite with him in his enterprise. They together besieged Constantinople for four months. Famine at last forced the surrender of the city. Michael took off his crown and gave it to Nicephorus with his own hands, and then retired for the remainder of his life to a monastery.

Malek despatched one of his emirs, Barsook, at the head



of a body of soldiers, with orders to slay Cutulmish. The emissary approached Constantinople, and demanded of the Emperor that Cutulmish should be delivered up to him. Nicephorus replied, "It would be bad faith to betray one who trusts us. But take him if you can; I will not interfere." The followers of Cutulmish and Barsook joined battle. After many had been slain on both sides, a cessation of arms took place, and Barsook said to Cutulmish, "Why should our followers perish? Let us, too, engage in single combat, with the condition that the person, followers, and property of the vanquished shall be subject to the control of the victor." Cutulmish acceded to the proposal. His enemy, however, practised fraud. He dressed a slave in his own garb, and sent him to encounter Cutulmish. Cutulmish overcame the slave, dispossessed him of his seat on horseback, and alighted to behead him. At this moment, some followers of Barsook, who were in readiness, basely rushed upon Cutulmish and slew him. Barsook was almost entirely deserted by his adherents for this ignominious transaction. Soliman, the son of Cutulmish, received large accessions to his party, and, leaving the Greek dominions, proceeded towards Tarsus, subduing many towns upon the sea coast. It was Soliman who laid the foundation of what is called the Suljukian kingdom of Rouen. It was not long ere, through the suggestion and assistance of the treacherous governor of Antioch, he besieged and took that city. He succeeded in reconciling the inhabitants of Antioch to his government. They were even more pleased with their new lord than with their former Armenian governor. He subsequently made an incursion into the interior of Asia Minor and took many cities from the Greeks (among them were Iconium and Nice), the defence of which he committed to his son, Kilidge Arslan, retiring himself to Antioch.

At this time an Arabian prince, named Sharfeddoolet Moosleem, ruled over all the territory from Sindia in Irak on the borders of the river Issa to Manbedge, including Mosul, Mesopotamia, Aleppo, and other countries lying along the Euphrates. While the city of Antioch was in the possession of the Greeks, they had paid tribute for it to Sharfeddoolet. When it came into Soliman's

hands he refused the accustomed tribute, and war ensued. In the result both princes were slain.\*

We have now reached a period (1087, A. D.) closely bordering upon the first (so called) holy war against the Mohammedans, and here we terminate our remarks, for the present.

F.

---

## ARTICLE VI.

### THE EDUCATION MOVEMENT IN MASSACHUSETTS.

WITHIN a few years past the government and people of our Commonwealth have seemed to awaken from their long protracted drowsiness and inactivity upon the subject of common education. A considerable degree of excitement has been felt and manifested all over the State, and much has been done in various ways to elevate the character and improve the influence of our common schools.

We have thought that our readers, whether in Massachusetts, or elsewhere, engaged as their regards must be in the cause of popular cultivation, and in the history of all reforms, would read with considerable interest a sketch of what has been done for education during the last three years in the "Old Bay State." We have, therefore, beginning with the institution of the Board of Education in 1837, prepared a pretty full account of the public acts, whether legislative or popular, upon this subject, which account we now proceed, without further preface, to lay before our friends.

The Massachusetts Board of Education was created by the legislative act of April 20, 1837. It is composed of the Governor and Lieut. Governor, *ex officiis*, and eight other persons to be named by the Governor and Council. The term of office is eight years, with a proviso that one

---

\* When Soliman died, Aboul Cassem assumed the Sultanship of Asia Minor; but at the period of Malek Shah's death, Kilidge Arslan obtained it. The dominions of Sharfeddoolet at his death fell into the hands of Malek Shah, who, by the advice of his vizier, gave Aleppo, Hamath, Manbedge and Ladikia, as a fief, to the Emir Casimed-doolet Acsancar.

vacancy and consequently one new appointment shall occur every year. The duties prescribed by the statute for the Board, were,—1st. To prepare an abstract of the school returns received by the Secretary of State (as superintendent of common schools), and lay the same before the Legislature as early as the second Wednesday of January in each year; and, 2d. To report their transactions in detail to the Legislature, with such observations as might be suggested by their reflection or experience on the condition and efficiency of our system of popular education, and the most practicable means of improving and extending it.\*

The Board of Education thus provided, by law, held its first meeting in the Council Chamber at Boston, June 29, 1837. In pursuance of the powers with which the Board was clothed, it proceeded to the choice of a secretary, and very happily, as we think for the education cause in this State, the choice fell upon the Honorable Horace Mann, then fresh from the Presidential Chair of the Massachusetts Senate, and who for ten years or more had been honored with a seat in one branch or the other of our General Court. Mr. Mann, in accordance with the wish of the Board, and upon the dictates of a pure patriotism abandoned a lucrative professional business as a lawyer, and the path of political honor which he had thus far so successfully trodden, and devoted himself wholly and heartily to the duties of his secretaryship with its meagre salary of a thousand dollars per annum.

The second act of the Board was to devolve upon their secretary the labor of preparing the abstract of the school returns.

The act creating the Board of Education prescribed the duties of its secretary in these words: "It shall be his duty, under the direction of the Board, to collect information of the actual condition and efficiency of the common schools, and other means of popular education, and to diffuse as widely as possible throughout every part of the Commonwealth information of the most approved and successful methods of arranging the studies and conducting the education of the young."

---

\* See Stat. 1837, c. 241.

At this first meeting of the Board, in June, the question came up, "What direction shall be given by us to the secretary, in regard to his duties?" Narrow and imperfect as were its powers, and depending, therefore, as the Board must, almost entirely on the voluntary coöperation, of the people, the members of that body could devise no method more likely to effect the object of the secretary's appointment, than a series of conventions, to be called successively in each county of the Commonwealth, to be composed of teachers, school committees and the friends of education from the several towns, at which conventions the secretary and some one member or more of the Board should also attend. This plan was accordingly adopted.

In pursuance of this scheme of at once animating the public mind and collecting needful information from among the people, the Board prepared and circulated throughout the Commonwealth an address to the people giving notice that such conventions would be called, recommending them to the consideration and encouragement of all good citizens, and advising the friends of education in every town to assemble and appoint delegates to the conventions.

Preparatory to the same object, the secretary drafted a circular letter addressed to school committees, and forwarded it to every town in each county, calling upon such committees to attend their county convention, and to procure the attendance of such other persons as might "be enabled to enlighten by their counsel, or contribute from their experience." This circular contained a series of interrogatories intended to elicit facts in reply from every town concerning the inconveniences and discomforts suffered in each from the construction or local situation of school-houses; and also in regard to the number and description of schools, the length of time during which they are kept and the qualifications of their teachers; the choice of committees and their faithfulness in the performance of duty; the compensation of committee men; their examination of teachers, and selection of books; the uniformity of books used in the same school; the use of apparatus, the number of professed teachers, *i. e.*, teachers who practise school-keeping as a regular employment, and other kindred topics.



The address and circular with the series of questions having been every where disseminated, the secretary of the Board, in August, 1837, near the close of the month, entered upon the active duties of the campaign of conventions thus prescribed. Between the 28th of that month and the 15th of the following November, he met and addressed conventions of the friends of education in every county in the State except the county of Suffolk; and, as the Board in their first Report have said with unquestionable truth, "his attendance and addresses at these public meetings were productive of the happiest effects, and were highly instrumental in awakening a new interest in the cause of school education."

These conventions, with but two exceptions, were very fully attended, and were supplied with representatives from almost every town in each county respectively. Of the character of these conventions for intelligence and moral worth, the first Report of the secretary speaks in the highest terms, and probably without exaggeration. It is obviously true, that "selfish and illaudable motives do not tempt men to abandon business, and incur expense, to attend distant meetings, when no emolument is to be secured, nor offices apportioned. A desire to promote a philanthropic object, whose full beneficence will not be realized until its authors shall have left the stage," is a motive which could have brought none but good and virtuous men together, members of all parties in politics, and of all sects in religion, laying aside all minor subjects and "reverting to their natural relations as fellow-men," met together in these conventions, and in the most friendly spirit, throwing as it were, into a common stock, the results of all their various reflection and experience. From such assemblies the least sanguine of the friends of school education might reasonably expect results of immediate and permanent value,—useful information, animating impulses, and a general diffusion amongst the people of a new interest in the cause of education. If we had no further proof that these assemblies were generally regarded with favor, we might find it in the statute (1838, c. 159) enacted by the next General Court, requiring the secretary to call them together in each county every year.

In his attendance upon these conventions the secretary adopted a mode of travel and conveyance that made him

master of his own time and movements, rendering it easy for him to stop wherever and whenever it might be expedient, or to deviate from the great direct routes of travel, for the purpose of making personal visitations and examinations whenever desirable, and of extending inquiries amongst those numerous and intelligent friends on every hand with whom he had, during his professional career, or while a member for many years of our multitudinous legislature, become acquainted. Many hundred miles were thus travelled by Mr. Mann, and many hundred school houses visited and minutely and carefully examined. In all but two of the counties thus visited associations were organized for the improvement of common schools. Similar associations had already been formed in these two excepted counties. These associations were made auxiliary to the Board of Education.

But in the midst of these useful labors, the secretary was interrupted by the necessity of returning to Boston, in order to prepare "the Annual Abstract of the School Returns." From the middle of Nov., 1837, to Jan. 1, 1838, nearly the whole time of the secretary was employed in preparing that Abstract. It is difficult to overrate the amount of labor expended in arranging clearly, systematically, and for the first time, the facts contained in the returns from two hundred and ninety-four towns, and in preparing a report to the Board containing the account of his official labors, the results of the numerous county conventions, of his correspondence, travels, inquiries and examinations, the substance of the answers rendered to his circular, and the fruits of all his meditation, study and reflection upon this great mass of information. The manner in which this labor was performed elicited the warmest approbation of the Board, and in their report they speak in deserved terms of eulogy alike of the abstract and of the secretary's report; of which last document they say, "We refer to it with great satisfaction, as a result of the organization of the Board of Education for the first year of its existence, in the highest degree creditable to its author, and likely to prove equally beneficial to the cause of education, and acceptable to the people of the Commonwealth."

This Abstract forms a large octavo volume of more than three hundred closely printed pages, and presents an

edifying contrast to the meagre though valuable documents of former years. We must now refer more particularly to the able Report of the secretary, as the next fact in the history which we are now endeavoring to trace.

The Report opens with a statement of many of the particulars that we have already mentioned, and a specification of the sources of information on which the secretary has relied as authentic; it is then divided into four general departments or topics, under one or the other of which all considerations relating to our common schools naturally arrange themselves.

In the collection of the facts embraced in these several divisions, the four principal sources of information regarded as authentic, are, 1st. "Statements, uncontradicted and unquestioned, publicly made at the county conventions, by gentlemen worthy of entire confidence, respecting facts alleged to be within their own personal knowledge." 2d. Direct written answers to the circular already described; which answers were received from more than half of the towns in the State. 3d. Direct personal inspection and examination. 4th. The school returns made under the statute to the Secretary of the Commonwealth.

The four cardinal topics, to one or the other of which all the aforementioned "considerations" refer themselves, are as follows, viz., 1. The situation, construction, condition and number of the school houses. 2. The manner in which school committees discharge their duties. 3. The interest felt by the community in the education of all its children, and the position in which a certain portion of that community stands in relation to the free schools. 4. The competency of teachers.

1. The first of these topics is discussed very briefly in the Report, not because the secretary considered it of small importance, but, on the contrary, that he might, in a second and supplemental Report, which was communicated to the Board some time in March, 1838, devote to it all the attention which its great practical value and interest demanded.

2. In considering the second topic,—the manner in which school committees discharge their legal duty,—a full exposé is made of the requirements of the law, and the

imperfect manner in which those requisitions are generally complied with. Thus, while the statute requires of the committee to ascertain, "*by personal examination*," the literary qualifications of teachers, and their capacity for the government of schools, as well as to obtain evidence of their good moral character, the tax upon the time of committees imposed by this requirement is so great that, says the Report, "from the best information obtained, it appears, that in a majority of instances the examination is wholly omitted," or is merely formal and superficial.

So, also, it appeared, that in two-thirds of the towns of the Commonwealth no regard was paid to the rule, which required every teacher to obtain from the school committee of the town a certificate of his qualifications, before opening his school. In considering this point, the Report suggested, that much practical inconvenience resulted from the cumbersome arrangement by virtue of which the teacher is engaged by the prudential committee, subject to the approval of the town committee.\*

The choice of books to be used in the schools is another and one of the most difficult and responsible duties of the school committees. Yet, although the neglect of this duty leads to the most serious inconveniences and substantial mischiefs, one hundred towns in Massachusetts were chargeable with that neglect, in 1837. In forty towns heard from, no attempt was made, in accordance with law, to supply these pupils with school books, whose parents, masters, or guardians, had failed to furnish them therewith.

The shocking neglect of committees and others, whose duty it was to see that the youth of their towns regularly attend their schools, may be inferred from the following results obtained from the returns of 1837 :

Number of children in Massachusetts, <i>between 4 and 16 years old</i> ,.....						177,053
Deduct 12,000 as the number of those who always attend private schools, and there remain, .....						165,053
Whole No. of <i>all ages</i> attending school in winter, as per returns,						141,837
do.	do.	do.	do.	summer,	do.	122,889
Average attendance in winter,.....						111,520
do	do.		summer,			94,956

\* This fault was remedied by the law of 1838, c. 105, § 2, authorizing the town committee to hire the masters, except when the town should by vote determine otherwise.



Thus the average winter attendance of children of all ages fell below the number of children between the ages of 4 and 16 by the enormous difference of 53,533, and in summer the difference was 70,097; "that is," to use Mr. Mann's words, "a portion of the children, wholly dependent on common schools, absent themselves from the winter school either permanently or occasionally, equal to a permanent absence of about one-third of their whole number." The summer absences were equal to a permanent absence of two-fifths of the whole number of scholars in all the common schools of Massachusetts.

The committee's duty of visitation, without the faithful discharge of which it is vain to expect well-ordered schools, was found to be strangely neglected; insomuch that of the three hundred and five towns of the Commonwealth, employing more than three thousand teachers, at an annual expense of more than \$465,000, not more than fifty or sixty towns pretended to any sort of compliance with the legal requirement.

This great neglect in the matter of visitation, as well as some other, the secretary attributes, in a considerable degree, to the fact, that, while school committees are burdened with an enormous amount of labor, involving an expenditure of time varying from six to sixty days per annum, and of money amounting sometimes to twenty or thirty dollars, they are wholly unpaid for their services in four-fifths of the towns; and that where any compensation is given, it amounts, in no case, to much more than one quarter part of the lowest wages of day labor. To the secretary's inquiry concerning the compensation of committees, the general answer was, "Nothing paid;" and in many others it amounted to "neither paid nor thanked." This want of compensation rendered the office undesirable, so that comparatively few men could afford or were willing to accept it, or when elected, to perform its duties. Under this aspect of the case, which, as delineated by Mr. Mann is mournful enough, he felt constrained to recommend a legal provision for the compensation of school committees, and some form of animadversion or penalty for gross delinquency in the discharge of their duty.\*

---

\* We shall find the result of this recommendation in the statute of 1838, c. 105, § 4, by which it is provided that the members of school committees, *except in the city of Bos-*

3. The next topic discussed in the Report was the interest felt (or rather *not* felt) by the community in the common schools. The general apathy which Mr. Mann portrayed, in January, 1838, in regard to these schools, he attributed, to two opposite causes, viz., *first*, an indifference on the part of many towards the education of youth,—an indifference inexcusable, in any republic;—and *second*, a regard so exalted for education as to look down somewhat scornfully upon the system of common schools, and which seeks in private schools and academies a course of instruction more thorough and better conducted.

The reciprocal action of these two opposite causes of mischief was amply and ably unfolded in the Report, and their evil tendencies feelingly described. As a cure for these mischiefs, the duty, the social and political duty, of a universal and ardent devotion to the common school system, was eloquently set forth and urged on the public attention; and more specially a strict obedience to that much abused requirement of law, by which every town containing five hundred families or householders or three thousand inhabitants, is bound to maintain a school for the benefit of all the inhabitants of the town, ten months at least, exclusive of vacations, in each year, to be kept by a competent master, who, in addition to the branches of learning required to be taught in the district schools, shall give instruction in the history of the United States, book-keeping, surveying, geometry and algebra; and by which, moreover, every town of four thousand inhabitants is required to sustain a school, the master of which shall be competent to teach Latin, Greek, general history, rhetoric and logic.

This wholesome law was almost entirely disregarded in 1837, in our large towns. Only fourteen of the forty-three towns coming within the law, paid any regard to it whatever; and of these fourteen, *one* was on the point of establishing, but had not then established, such a school; and *two* were supplied therewith under provisions so meagre that a part only of the town could take advantage of them. The mischiefs of this neglect are manifold. It drives a portion of the population to the establishment of

---

*ton*,—which, although the labor there is greatest, pays its committee *nothing*!—shall be paid by their respective towns, one dollar each per day for the time they shall be actually employed in official duty, with such additional compensation as the town may allow.

private schools or academies,—institutions whose establishment of course diminishes the annual appropriations of the town for common schools, draws off from such schools their most promising scholars, monopolizes the best teachers, so that the district schools are reduced in length, deteriorated in quality, bereft to a certain extent of talents competent for instruction, and of the regard and assistance of the most zealous friends of good education.

4. Finally, as to the qualifications of teachers. The Report complained of an extensive want of suitable instructors for our common schools,—a want arising, however, in no small degree, from the prevalent disinclination to pay a fair price for the intellectual labor of the teacher. The average rate of compensation for teachers throughout the State, including the liberal salaries of all the large towns, and exclusive of board, was, for males, \$15,44 per month, or \$185,28 per annum!—and for females \$5,38 per month, or \$64,56 per annum! At such beggarly rates of hire, it is indeed madness to expect any considerable amount of talent or learning in the profession. For the tuition of the 27,266 pupils in all the private schools of Massachusetts (one-sixth of the whole number of children taught in the State), there was an annual expenditure of \$328,026 75; while the sum raised by taxation for all the children in the Commonwealth was only \$465,228 04. In considering the expediency of making some legal provision for an increase of the rate of compensation, the Report made it appear, that taking the valuation of the State at the moderate estimate of \$300,000,000, the amount of money raised by taxation for schools (\$465,228 04) was at the rate of less than one mill and sixth-tenths of a mill on the dollar, something more than one six-hundredth part of the valuation!

As appertaining to the competency of teachers, the Report urged the importance of moral culture,—of cultivating the principles and affections,—of training the heart. The law forbids the introduction of school books calculated to favor particular creeds and tenets;—the more need, then, of highly moral and religious teachers;—men of pure and upright principles, conduct and conversation; and especially as among the whole army of school books, there were found but *three* intended to inculcate “the beautiful and sublime truths of ethics and natural relig-

ion," and these three were used in only *six* of the 2918 schools from which returns were received.

The Report concludes with a brief notice of the benefits already experienced from the statute of April, 1837, concerning the instruction of children employed in manufacturing establishments; a complaint in regard to the extremely limited use of apparatus or visible illustrations in the business of teaching, and some valuable suggestions upon the formation of town associations for the improvement of common schools, on the practice of keeping school registers, and upon the awkwardness of the time at which the school committees are elected (in the spring), in relation to the time when they are bound to make their annual returns (in October).

Such was the first Report made by the secretary to the Board of Education: a document of far greater merit and ability than our hasty analysis would indictate.

This Report of the secretary, together with the abstract of school returns, and the first annual Report of the Board itself was sent to the Legislature of 1838.

The Report of the Board specially directed legislative attention to the subject of improvements in school houses; the compensation of school committees; the establishment of schools for teachers, or Normal schools; the publication of the District School Library series, and the introduction of such libraries into the schools in pursuance of the act of April 12, 1837; the establishment of a Common School Journal, and the recommendation or requisition of a uniform series or catalogue of school books.

Upon the subject of school houses, the Board suggested the propriety of offering from the school fund some inducement to the towns to adopt such improvements in the construction of those buildings, as are shown by reason and experience to be of great practical importance; referring the Legislature to the supplemental report of the secretary then in preparation, for a more perfect exhibition of the merits of this suggestion.

In regard to the compensation of school committees, the Board adopted Mr. Mann's suggestion, and recommended the enactment of a law in conformity therewith;—which recommendation, as we have already stated, was acted on by the Legislature.



The Board did not deem it advisable to recommend any legislative action upon the subject of publishing school libraries,—preferring to leave this matter to the enterprise and at the risk of our book-selling houses, and thinking that the statute of April 12, 1837 made ample provision on this subject. By that act every school district is authorized to raise, by taxation, the sum of thirty dollars for the first year, and ten dollars every succeeding year, to be expended in the purchase of a library and apparatus for its school.

They also suggested, as a remedy for the multiplicity, variety and imperfection of school books, that the Board be first authorized to select the best of each class now in use, and recommend them for universal adoption, with additional power, if this measure should prove unavailing or insufficient, to require the use of the books thus recommended as a condition of receiving a share of the benefit of the school funds.

Such were some of the first fruits of our Board of Education and its secretary, communicated to the General Court in January, 1838, just about six months after their first meeting as a Board. We ought, also, to include among the results of their first year's efforts, the supplemental report of the secretary, on school houses, communicated in March, and the various modifications of the law resulting from these several reports at the session of 1838.

The Report, on the prevalent defects of school houses, treats of a subject to which all who ever passed through the grievous trial, the *peine forte et dure*, of boyhood in a country school house are nervously alive.

Mr. Mann, in the spirit of philanthropy, and with the skill of a scientific critic, goes largely into the subject of school-house architecture, under the several divisions of ventilation and warming, size, desks, seats, location, light, windows, play grounds, and the duty of instructors in regard to these edifices.

We cannot follow the Report into all its details, however interesting and important they may be, but must make our analysis as brief and rapid as possible. Under the head of location of school houses, there are some valuable suggestions in regard to a gradation of schools, by which scholars of widely different ages and degrees of

attainment may be placed in separate schools, so as not to impede each other's progress. A suggestion is made, that districts should be allowed, when desirous of so doing, to unite in the establishment of schools of a higher grade, for the benefit of the more advanced classes; and it is shown by a simple computation that such an arrangement could be made at a considerable saving of both time and money, while a superior degree of professional skill might also be thereby secured. The views taken by Mr. Mann are abundantly fortified by the opinions of Drs. John C. Warren, and Edward Reynolds, of Boston, Dr. Woodward of the Worcester Hospital, Professor Silliman, Dr. Howe of the Blind Asylum, and Mr. Jenkins, a practical architect, whose letters were appended to the Report, and communicated to the Legislature. These various communications were received and read with great interest by the Legislature of 1838. A variety of causes had combined to awaken the public feeling upon the subject of education, and the new condition of the general feeling was strongly reflected in the legislative body. As might be expected, most of the suggestions of the Board and of its secretary, became the basis of legislation. Let us look more closely into that matter.

The earliest legislative movement which followed the reception of these reports was the act of March 31, c. 55, which is an act to provide that the members of the Board of Education shall be reimbursed for all expenses incurred in the discharge of their official duties. This was but an act of justice. Their next act was the more comprehensive statute of April 13, 1838 (c. 105). This law makes various improvements upon former acts, in accordance with Mr. Mann's suggestions. In the first place, it directs school committees to make an annual and detailed report of the condition of the respective schools in their several towns, designating particular improvements and defects in the methods or means of education, and stating such facts and suggestions in relation thereto, as in their opinion will best promote the interests and increase the usefulness of said schools. This report of the town committee is, by law, to be read in open town meeting, every year, or be printed and distributed for the use of the inhabitants; the original to be deposited with the town clerk, and an attested copy to be sent to the Secretary of State with the school

return. In the second place, it authorizes the town committee to select and contract with the teachers of the town and district school, without the intervention of the prudential committee. It commands the school committee in each town to keep a record book and record of all their proceedings, votes, &c., to be handed over to their successors in office. It provides a compensation for their services at the rate of a dollar for each day spent in official duty. It authorizes the Board of Education to prescribe the form of the blanks for school returns, and to fix the time when they should be returned into the office of the Secretary of State. It also authorizes the Board to prescribe a form of register to be kept in all town and district schools; and directs the secretary to furnish the school committees therewith, and said committees to cause the same to be faithfully kept in every school.

Those who have attentively perused the foregoing pages will perceive how nearly, in most particulars, these legal provisions are an echo to the utterance of the reports of the Board of Education and of the secretary.

On the 19th of April, 1838, a resolution relating to Normal schools, or schools for teachers, passed both branches of the Legislature. Its origin and history are quite interesting. A munificent individual of ample means,\* deeply impressed with the importance of doing something to elevate the standard qualifications of teachers, placed the sum of *ten thousand dollars* at the disposal of the Board of Education, to be disbursed under their direction, in qualifying teachers for common schools, provided the Commonwealth would appropriate the same amount in like manner. The donation was promptly accepted by the government, and the like sum appropriated accordingly, to be disbursed by the Board at their unlimited discretion, "in qualifying teachers for the common schools of Massachusetts."

On the 21st of April was passed an act to prescribe the duties and fix the compensation of the secretary of the Board of Education. The duties prescribed by this act correspond exactly with the course of procedure which the Board had already pursued of their own free will. The second section of the act increased the salary of the

---

\* Hon. Edmund Dwight, of Boston.

secretary to fifteen hundred dollars, and thus signified the just appreciation of his services entertained by the Legislature. Four days later in the session, under date of April 25, 1838, we have another important legislative act, in the 189th chapter, entitled, "An act concerning the union of school districts." The first section of the law authorizes any two or more school districts which are contiguous, to associate and form a union district for the purpose of maintaining a union school, to be kept for the benefit of the older children of the associated districts. This provision of law is a simple adoption of Mr. Mann's recommendation, made in his supplemental report, for the purpose of establishing different grades of schools, by means of which more advanced scholars might be supplied with a higher class of teachers than is needful for younger children.

The second section of the statute confers corporate powers upon these union districts, and the three following sections prescribe the manner of calling a meeting of such union district, of choosing a clerk, of raising money for certain purposes, and of locating the union school houses.

The purposes for which money may be raised are the erection, purchase, rent and repair of school houses; the purchase or hire of land for the use of the same; and the purchase of fuel, furniture and other necessary articles for the use of the school. When the districts cannot agree on the location of a school house, the selectmen of the town shall determine the question.

The sixth section provides that the prudential committee of the several associated districts shall together form the prudential committee of the union district, their powers to correspond for the union district with those which they severally possess in their respective local districts.

The seventh section further authorizes this committee, subject to the votes of the union district, to determine the age and qualification of the pupils of the union school, the compensation of the teacher, and the mode of apportioning the school money raised by the town and appropriated to the several districts.

The eighth and last section extends the authority of town school committees over these union districts, thus rendering it apparent that the union of adjoining districts lying in different townships is not contemplated by the law.



This sketch completes the history of the first year of our common schools under the Board of Education; let us now go forward to the history of the year 1838. The Legislature having adjourned, Mr. Mann must now again traverse the fourteen counties of the State, attending conventions, delivering addresses, inspecting school houses, collecting all kinds of information. Before departing from the metropolis on this tour of conventions, Mr. Mann must prepare and disseminate his catechetical circular,—his *avant courier* of inquiry to the schools,—for the purpose of concentrating the thoughts of delegates upon some specific points and topics of interest.

Surveying the wide field of education, it may well embarrass the secretary to limit his inquiries and confine them within reasonable bounds. Where shall reform first begin? Which of the thousand mischiefs of the present administration of our school system shall be first assailed. The result of Mr. Mann's deliberations was a conviction that the mode of teaching our children the orthography and significance of their mother tongue, and the degree of success found to attend it, might, as well as any other topic, be made the special subject of his inquiry, and to those matters, therefore, did he particularly point his circular inquisitive.

This preliminary document having been forwarded to its destination, the secretary embarks upon his voyage of exploration. Beginning at Nantucket, Mr. Mann attended fourteen county conventions, all of them (with three exceptions) full and numerous, and he addressed them all upon the subject of education. He found the people every where awake and alive upon the object of his mission, ready to listen, anxious to learn. In these meetings he was attended and aided by some one or more members of the Board, and by many of the most distinguished and respected of our citizens.

Quite a number of towns availed themselves of the statute provision for the formation of union districts, and in several of the counties associations were formed to procure the delivery of lectures throughout the county on the subject of education, seven, at least, of the counties, being thus more or less supplied with the popular means of instruction. These counties were Nantucket, Hampden, Hampshire, Franklin, Worcester, Essex and Suffolk.

In this work of lecturing were engaged men of all the learned professions, as well as other intelligent citizens. Other indications of an advancing public opinion were observed: in the greater diligence of school committees as to the examination of teachers, and the visitation of schools; in the increased zeal of teachers themselves, and the growing interest of parents, as well as the faithful manner in which, with scarcely an exception, the school register was kept according to the provisions of the statute of 1838. Such were the fruits which came within the observation of the secretary, in his career of inspection and inquiry.

We now return to the movements of the Board. Their first care, and one that extended itself throughout the year, was the disposal of the Normal school fund. The trust with which they were invested in regard thereto was one of great delicacy and responsibility. In the first place, they were left without instruction in reference to its disposition. It was to be expended "in qualifying teachers of common schools;"—but how;—under what regulations; by what mode and process? In the second place, no institutions for the education of teachers, or Normal schools, properly so called, had ever yet been established in this country. They were common, indeed, in Europe; but they existed there under circumstances so different from any thing known among us, as to render imitation difficult, if not impracticable.

Without going minutely into the history of the discussions and doubts of the Board, it will be sufficient for us to say, that it was finally determined to establish as early as practicable three or four Normal schools in different parts of the Commonwealth. It was supposed that \$20,000 would be sufficient to sustain that number of institutions for the period of three years, in such manner as to settle the question of their utility and of their final adoption by the State as a part of our school system.

No sooner was this determination of the Board made public, than applications were sent in from towns and academies in all directions, to induce the Board to select particular locations for the Normal schools, and establish them in connection with the respective applicants, offering in many instances the most liberal and hearty coöperation and assistance in the provision of buildings, apparatus, and

current funds. But it was not till the 28th of December that the Board determinately fixed on any one locality. At their meeting of that date, it was resolved to establish a Normal school for the education of female teachers in the town of Lexington, in Middlesex county. They were led to this determination, not less by the advantageous position of that charming little village, than by the liberality of its citizens and the citizens of Middlesex at large. It was also determined to establish a similar institution, for both sexes, in the town of Barre, in Worcester county.

The regulations adopted by the Board for the Normal schools to be established, as reported in January, 1839, required that candidates for admission should have attained the age of sixteen years, if females, and seventeen, if males; and that they should remain to be instructed for a period not exceeding three years, nor less than one. The course of study contemplates, 1st, the attainment of a thorough familiarity with all the studies (Latin and Greek excepted) required by statute to be taught in the highest grade of our public schools, together with ethics and the general principles of Christianity; and, 2d, the art of instruction and school government.

To provide, so far as lay in their power, a class of books which might be safely and usefully purchased by school districts for the formation of common school libraries, under the power granted to districts by the act of 12th April, 1837, the Board determined to *recommend* to some respectable publishing house the issue of two series of works, one for the use of children, and the other for readers more advanced. The house of Marsh, Capen, Lyon & Webb, of Boston, adopted the suggestion, and agreed to publish the two series, at their own expense and risk, in a style and at a price approved by the Board; into which series no work should be introduced that had not been first examined, approved and recommended by every member of the Board.

Such were the transactions of the Board and the leading acts of the secretary, as set forth in their several official documents for the second year of their existence. The Report of their secretary bears date Dec. 26, and that of the Board, Dec. 28, 1838. Of these papers it will be needless to speak in detail. They contain much of the narrative already given, and besides that, the Report of

the secretary contains an elaborate and able inquiry into the prevalent mischiefs of incorrect spelling and unintelligent, mechanical reading, and into the great practical importance of discovering and applying a remedy for those evils. Of this essay, which we are informed, has been productive of material and extensive reforms in our schools, our limits forbid us to attempt even an analysis. We must rest content with recommending its perusal to all who feel an interest in the great cause of popular education.

Let us now glance at the legislation of 1839, upon the subject of education. It is contained in two statutes. By the act of March 18, 1839, it is required that every town in the Commonwealth shall support one school or more for the period of six months in every year, supplied with a competent teacher, for the instruction of children in orthography, reading, writing, English grammar, geography, arithmetic and *good behaviour*,—with a proviso, that in every district whose average number of scholars shall amount to fifty, the teacher of the school shall be supplied with one female assistant or more, unless the district shall by vote dispense with such auxiliary teaching.

The same act further provides, by an extension of the law of April 25, 1838, already mentioned, that any two or more contiguous school districts may unite and form a union district for the support of a school for the older children thereof, in accordance with the suggestion of Mr. Mann, contained in his first Report. It was furthermore provided, that the school fund should be annually distributed amongst the cities and towns, in the ratio of the children in each city or town between the ages of four and sixteen years; and that no such apportionment should be made to any town which shall have failed for the year preceding the distribution, either in making the requisite school returns, or in raising by taxation for the support of its schools, a sum equivalent to one dollar and a quarter for every child between the specified ages residing in said town. This last provision, in the nature of a penalty, is almost the only compulsory feature in the whole code of our laws on education.

The only other statute of 1839 upon this subject is that of April 9th, concerning the choice of prudential committees of three in townships which shall entrust to such



committees the business of selecting and hiring school teachers.

The history of the Education Board, and of the doings of its indefatigable secretary for the year past, is of considerable interest. During the year, Mr. Mann, in pursuance of his duty, visited every county in the State, and held conventions therein; carried on an immense correspondence with all parts of the Commonwealth, and prepared as the Abstract of the School Returns, an octavo volume of about three hundred pages, crowded with information of the greatest interest to all good citizens, besides composing, as his third annual report, a document even more valuable than that abstract.

The attendance upon these county conventions was such as to indicate an increasing and general attention among the people to the subject of common schools, and taken in connection with other facts, induced the secretary of the Board to express his conviction, "that the prospects of the rising generation are daily growing brighter."

New and increased zeal was manifested, in the most unequivocal and valuable forms, concerning the education of a class of children hitherto little cared for,—the children of that large body of men who are employed as operatives along the line of our public works.

By the inquiries of Mr. Mann, it was ascertained that, as a general rule, the law of 1836, "for the better instruction of youth employed in manufacturing establishments," is obeyed throughout the State. The substance of that statute is, that no child under fifteen years of age shall be employed in any manufactory, who has not attended some public or private school where instruction is given by some legally qualified teacher, at least three out of the twelve months next preceding any and every year of such employment. The penalty of each violation is \$50, to be paid by the employer. This enactment is generally regarded, and especially so in all our large manufacturing establishments; and in some cases these establishments have taken very commendable pains to ensure obedience to the law, by creating school houses and supporting teachers.

Among the various means of popular education, while our common schools have engaged more particularly the attention of Mr. Secretary Mann, the subjects of books,

libraries, and lyceums have not been forgotten. The correspondence of the secretary for the year 1839 was devoted to the acquisition of correct information concerning these other auxiliary agents of education. Letters were addressed by him to every town in Massachusetts, soliciting evidence upon this matter, and replies were received from all but sixteen of those townships. From those answers, it appears that the whole number of social libraries in the towns heard from, was *two hundred and ninety-nine*, that these libraries contained about 180,000 volumes; the value of which was estimated at \$191,538; the whole number of persons having the right of access to these institutions was less than twenty-six thousand. The sixteen towns not heard from contained a population of about 21,000.

There were some fifty district school libraries, containing nearly 10,000 volumes. There were also about fifteen town libraries, containing an aggregate of three or four thousand volumes.

At the largest computation, not more than one hundred thousand individuals, or less than one-seventh portion of our population, have access, in any way to any of these libraries. There are a hundred towns in Massachusetts wholly destitute of libraries in any form. The number of mechanic's institutes in the State, so far as heard from, was eight: embracing some fourteen hundred members. There were one hundred and thirty-seven lyceums, on whose lectures the average attendance amounts to about twenty-one thousand persons.

The character of the books composing these various libraries is, on the whole, miserably bad. Mr. Mann reckons the proportion of comparatively useless or pernicious works at nineteen-twentieths of the whole number. His remarks on the injurious influence of the current trashy literature of the day, and on the vast importance of introducing safe and instructive works into general circulation, are eloquent and true, and worthy of profound consideration. The establishment of school district libraries seems to the secretary to promise something like an efficient remedy both for the common want of books and for the deficiency of works of genuine value, and he therefore urges, through the Board, upon the Legislature, the adoption of measures chiefly to facilitate the formation of such libraries.

The Normal schools at Barre and Lexington, the first under the charge of Professor Newman, and the second under the superintendence of Mr. Pierce, were brought into successful operation during the year 1839. These schools were tolerably well attended, and seemed to give promise of beneficial results. There is a model school connected with the Lexington institution, in which the art of teaching is practised and illustrated.

The whole expense of the Normal schools for 1839 fell short of \$1000. The people of Plymouth county, impressed with the desirableness of these institutions, have raised by subscription the sum of \$10,000, for the purpose of enabling the Board of Education to establish a Normal school in that county upon a scale at once generous and ample,—a liberality worthy of the Old Colony.

During the past year, also, the publication of the District School Library has been commenced by the publishers already named, under the sanction of the Board of Education. Ten volumes of the large, and two of the juvenile, series, have been issued from the press. Many other works are in the various stages of preparation for the series.

Last, but not least, amongst the fruits of the Education Board for 1839, we must specify the "Abstract of the School Returns for 1838—9," presented to the Legislature in January last. This Abstract, composing a thick octavo volume, the materials of which were drawn from the returns of 298 towns and the reports made in accordance with the act of April 13, 1838, by the committees of 170 towns, is another monument of Mr. Mann's prodigious industry and unabated ardor. Let us see a little more clearly how this volume was compiled.

By votes passed May 30, 1839, and October 22, 1839, the Education Board directed their secretary to superintend the preparation of the usual annual abstract, and to make and append thereto such extracts from the reports of school committees as he might think proper. These reports formed a mass of documents equal to about 1200 closely printed letter pages. Mr. Mann, in the brief letter to the Board of Education which accompanies this volume, speaks in high terms of the interest and value of the Abstract thus laboriously compiled. And we doubt not that his encomiums are abundantly deserved.

It is impracticable for us to go minutely into an examination of the volume, however edifying the task might be. We have preferred to present in a note\* a tabular view of

\* GENERAL ABSTRACT OF THE SCHOOL RETURNS  
FOR THE YEARS 1834 TO 1839 INCLUSIVE.

	1834	1835	1836	1837	1838-9
No. of towns from which returns were made, .....	261	277	289	294	298
No. of School Districts in those towns, .....	2251	2397	2517		
No. of public schools in do., some districts having none, .....				2918	3014
No. of children between 4 and 16 years old, .....	No return,	No return,	166,912	177,053	182,191
No. of male children attending school, — from 4 to 16 yrs. old, .....	67,499	73,254	75,552		
No. of female do. ....	63,728	68,823	70,987		
No. of scholars of all ages in all the schools, summer and winter, .....				w. 141,837 s. 122,889	w. 148,628 s. 122,330
No. over 16 and under 21, unable to read and write, .....	158	No return,	No return,	No return,	
Average attendance in the schools, winter and summer, ...				w. 111,520 s. 94,956	w. 116,855 s. 93,814
No. of male instructors, .....	1967	2088	2154	2370	2411
No. of female instructors, .....	2318	2548	2816	3591	3625
Amount raised by tax to support schools, ..	\$310,178 87	\$340,857 89	\$391,993 96	\$465,228 04	\$479,744 84a
Amount raised by contribution to support schools, .....	\$15,141 28	\$23,868 28	\$47,593 44	\$48,301 15	
No. of academies and private schools, ....	No return,	No return,	No return,	854	
Average No. of scholars attending academies and private schools, .....	24,749	24,278	28,752	27,266	
Estimated amt paid for tuition in do., ..	\$276,575 75	\$209,194 07	\$326,642 53	\$328,026 75	
Population, .....				691,222	695,550
Valuation (1830), ...				\$206,457,662 58	\$207,785,308 30
No. of incorporated academies, .....					73
No. of scholars attending do., .....					3599
Paid for tuition of do. ....					\$54,113 69
No. of unincorporated academies, private schools and schools kept to prolong public schools, .....					1100
No. of scholars in do., .....					24,548
Paid for tuition of do. ....					\$270,462 80

The abstract prepared by Mr. Sec'y Mann presents many items not contained in the preceding table, and states some of the old matter in a new form.

In consequence of an alteration directed by the Board of Education in the time of making the town returns for 1838, the abstract prepared by Mr. Mann includes a part of 1838 and a part of 1839, commencing in Oct. 1838, and ending with Sept. 1839.

a This item includes 1st the money raised for wages by taxation, and 2d contributions of fuel and board.



some of the leading facts contained in the various abstracts of the last five years.

We have now brought the history of the Board of Education down to the commencement of the last session of our Legislature, in January, 1840. On the 3d of March, 1840, an order was passed by the House of Representatives, "that the Committee on Education *consider* the expediency of abolishing the Board of Education and the Normal schools." That committee, on the 7th of March, presented their Report, recommending the abolition of the Board and of the Normal schools. This document was the expression of sentiments and opinions entertained by a majority of the committee. A minority report was prepared and presented by the other members, advocating the continuance of the Normal school experiment and of the Education Board. These reports were both printed, and form the 49th and 53d of the House documents, 1840.

We now come upon disputed ground, and if our article had not already extended beyond the ordinary bounds, motives of prudence might suggest the propriety of drawing to a close here. But our object thus far has been purely historical, and in this view it remains only to add, that no legislation resulted from either report, and that the Board of Education and the Normal schools are consequently still in operation.

---

## ARTICLE VII.

CHARLES ELWOOD.

*Charles Elwood, or the Infidel converted.* By O. A. BROWNSON. Boston. Charles C. Little and James Brown. 16mo. pp. 262.

THE conversion of a soul is one of the most interesting phenomena that can be presented to a rational observer. If, as most men suppose, and have ever supposed, there exists some strange perversity in our moral nature; if

man be forming habits which involve in their very essence the elements of misery; if the moral be that part of his nature which must give a coloring to his whole destiny; if he be immortal, and the present a probationary state; and if, from the constitution of things, every man must, to a considerable extent, impress upon others the image of his own moral likeness, then, surely, no event in his history can compare in interest with that in which a radical and beneficial change is effected in his inmost soul. It is, surely, a glorious sight, to behold the affections of an immortal spirit raised from the frivolous and transitory pleasures of time, and fixed upon things above, to see the spirit, disenthralled from the dominion of the passions, walking abroad in the liberty with which Christ hath made us free; and the soul, deformed by those tendencies which must ensure her perdition, purified, sanctified and transformed, made meet to be an inheritor with the saints in light.

This change, at all times interesting, is peculiarly grateful to the pious mind, when the subject of it has been an infidel. The idea of moral obligation to the Supreme Being, the feeling of confidence in his justice and of trust in his mercy, specially as these are set forth in the gospel of Jesus Christ, are so appropriate to the conditions of our being; they present so emphatically *the* support which the spirit needs, while encountering the thousand ills that flesh is heir to, that it is difficult to look without pity upon a human being who, from any cause whatever, shuts himself out from all the bland and cheering influences which they shed abroad upon the soul. And hence, when such a man renounces his unbelief, and proclaims, not only that he believes Christianity to be true, but also that he has submitted his heart to its requirements, and has confided his destinies for eternity to its hopes, it might reasonably be expected, that the Christian world should hail the accession of the new convert with unusual expressions of satisfaction. There is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth.

It may, therefore, be supposed, that, as *Christian* reviewers, we should be among the first to announce to our readers, that another infidel was converted. If we have not, on this occasion, manifested all the alacrity which the

nature of the case might seem to demand, it must be imputed to other causes than indifference to the subject of conversion; at least, of conversion as we understand it. We are obliged to add this last qualification, inasmuch as we find that many of our old and well established words are fast losing their personal identity. The conversion of our author, as our readers will have occasion to observe, is a very different thing from all that they have been accustomed to understand by that term. They must not be surprised now-a-days, if they find the words *regeneration*, *religious experience*, *holiness*, and even the sacred name of *God* himself, in very strange juxtapositions. It has cost us no little pains to ascertain what it was in which consisted the conversion of the hero of this tale. Whatever change these pages record, we can discover none which affects character in any of its important aspects. The man, after his conversion, was the same that he had been before, only that he had learned to entertain a somewhat different estimate of himself, and had brought himself to repose a doubtful belief in facts which he had formerly treated as fabulous.

But it is time we addressed ourselves to the consideration of the book before us. We are happy to be able to speak well of it in several respects. It is, we think, unusually well written. The style is clear, manly, forcible, and in general, simple and correct. The only error of any consequence in our author's forms of construction which we noticed, is an occasional omission of the relative, or some other slight inadvertence, such as will readily arise in the course of hasty and earnest composition. Wherever obscurity exists, it is to be attributed mainly to the nature of the subject, and not to muddiness of mind. In this respect, the author is very happily contrasted with very many of the disciples of that school to which he is reputed to belong.

Nor is this all. The intellectual system which it embraces is that of Cousin. And we are informed in the preface, that "Mr. Morton has *anticipated* some of the results" of that celebrated French metaphysician. In other words, we understand the author to say that he, without any aids but his own reflection, arrived at the same doctrines as have given to Cousin so wide a notoriety. This certainly is enough to bespeak for him among the

disciples of the Eclectic school a sincere and cordial tribute of respect. Whatever admiration may be due to Cousin, must be shared with him who can establish the claim to have arrived independently at the same results.

But it is proper, before we proceed to make any remarks upon the sentiments of this book, to give our readers a brief account of what it contains.

The work is written in the form of a narrative. It opens with an interview between the hero, Charles Elwood, and Mr. Smith, a Calvinist minister, who calls to see him for the purpose of religious conversation. There is a revival in the village. Mr. Elwood is an infidel. Mr. Smith attempts to direct his attention to religious subjects, and to remove his unbelief. In this attempt, Mr. S. is signally worsted, and he retires from the field, leaving Mr. Elwood in undisturbed possession of the battleground.

In the meantime, Elizabeth Wyman, to whom C. Elwood is tenderly attached, and to whom also he is betrothed, is converted. She brings to bear upon him all the persuasions of affection; and urges him to attend an inquiry meeting. He attends, and encounters another clergyman, who eludes the grasp of his logic by appointing a meeting at a subsequent time. At the hour C. Elwood visits him, and puts him to rout with almost as much facility as he had done his reverend brother Smith.

While matters are in this position, Mr. Smith calls upon Miss Wyman, and obtrusively dissuades her from marrying Charles Elwood. She resolves to dismiss him, and does so. Her brother treats him rudely, and forbids him their house. In the state of excitement produced by these events, he calls, by a second appointment, on Mr. Wilson, and becomes, by unkind treatment, greatly exasperated. He leaves his home, wanders for a time without object or aim, until he resolves to set himself in earnest to cure the evils of society by creating a social revolution. This attempt signally fails, and poor, disheartened, and out of sorts with the world, he is on the verge of madness, when a benevolent gentleman, Mr. Howard, makes his acquaintance, and strives to do him good. The kindness of Mr. Howard and his family won upon the heart of our reformer, and he begins to think better of man in general and of Mr. Howard and his family in particular. His



health, which had become prostrated by excessive and dispiriting labor, is restored. The world appears less sombre than before. By degrees he begins to converse with his host on the subject of religion, and, though an avowed atheist, he is convicted by Mr. Howard of being not only a *theist* but a *Christian*; and he learns, to his surprise, that it was his Christianity, and not his infidelity, which created all the hostility which he had for so long a time cherished toward clergymen and the church. This, of course, set our hero to thinking. He found himself, unexpectedly, in very strange company. He went to hear the Rev. Mr. Morton, Mr. Howard's clergyman, preach, and spent much time in the company of this learned divine. From this gentleman, Charles Elwood acquired some new notions of Christianity, and received a new demonstration both of the being of God and of the proposition that, let a man say what he may, or disbelieve what he may, yet to be an atheist is impossible. The arguments and revelations thus brought to bear upon him are effectual. Charles Elwood is converted, he becomes a theist and a Christian; at least, so says the narrative. For ourselves, however, as we said before, we are unable to perceive in what the conversion consists. Before any change had taken place in him, while to his own consciousness he was an atheist, Mr. Howard discovered him to be a Christian. All that follows is rather a showing of the correspondence of Christianity with his own previous notions. To our view, the change, or conversion, as it is called, is rather in Christianity than in the hero; and we think the book would be much more correctly entitled, Charles Elwood, or Christianity Converted.

It will be at once perceived, that, with this little narrative may be interwoven a great variety of discussions upon the most important principles of social and religious philosophy. Such, accordingly, do we find to be the fact. This, indeed, as we are told, was the main purpose of the author. To examine all the opinions maintained by the various disputants introduced in these pages would be impossible within the limits to which an article like the present must of necessity be restricted. We, however, are disposed to examine a few of them; and perhaps even the cursory review which our limits allow will be more than our readers in general will consider desirable.

One of the first questions which presents itself to a reader of this book is the following: In what light does the author intend that his work shall be understood? Is it a narrative of facts, setting forth transactions that actually occurred, or, is it a fiction of the imagination, intended merely to delineate manners, and exhibit a state of society in which such transactions would naturally occur? Some things would lead us to believe that the former is the intention of the author, and that he has here given us the substance of his own personal history. Thus, in the preface, it is observed, "I am willing [that] the public should take the book as an account which I have thought proper to give of my former unbelief and present belief." Such, accordingly, has, we think, been the general impression. It has been taken as a matter of undeniable verity, that our author was actually persecuted and driven almost to madness by drivelling priests and changeable young women. We have been assured that the Rev. Mr. Smith was a clergyman in — county, New York, and that Mr. Howard was another gentleman with whom we happen to be acquainted. In fact, we presume that every one supposes the events recorded in these pages to be, under names feigned or not feigned, the personal experiences of our author.

Here, then, is a narrative intentionally or unintentionally so constructed as to produce the effect of deliberate and grave assertion, and implicating in no trifling degree the character of men and classes of men. Were we to examine it in this light, we should wish for a little more exact information. We would ask who were Mr. Smith, and Mr. Wyman, and Mr. Wilson, and who were the clergymen associated in his study who basely insulted an inquirer after truth, and who, when he had retired, confessed to each other, without blushing, their own hideous hypocrisy? We should like to call these witnesses to the stand, and confront them with Charles Elwood. As he has given his account of these interviews, we should like to hear their account also. We should like to inquire whether Charles Elwood had never been treated with disinterested kindness by these despised, revival-loving Calvinists, and whether he had manifested no other traits of character than those which he has delineated in the portraiture of himself. All these points would, of neces-

sity, be considered, if we contemplate this work as a personal narrative. Without such an examination, we should be unable to decide whether Charles Elwood was the party sinned against, or the party sinning. But the means of such an investigation are not afforded us; and we must leave the question as we found it. It may not, however, be amiss to suggest to our author, that individuals and classes of men may be libelled by matter purporting to be a narrative under feigned names. It is not long since a clergyman of Massachusetts suffered imprisonment for publishing the story so well known under the name of Deacon Giles' Distillery. Christianity, *as we understand it*, teaches us to speak evil of no man.

Before we leave this part of the subject, there is, however, one topic on which we are disposed to bestow a single remark. Charles Elwood informs us that he was betrothed to a very estimable and lovely young lady; and that the engagement was broken off in consequence of the impertinent and obtrusive advice administered by a *priest* named Mr. Smith. For the obtrusion of one man upon the affairs of another we make no apology, for we have none to make. Charles Elwood himself, by no means a novice in giving utterance to the language of indignation, could feel no more indignant at such conduct than ourselves. If any man, priest or no priest, has thus interfered with the personal relations of his neighbors, let him be despised. We shall be the last to utter a word in palliation of this offence. While, however, we freely say all this, we cannot but add that there seems a strange aspect of inconsistency spread over the face of the narrative, which leaves us wholly unable to ascertain in how far Mr. Smith was the author of Charles Elwood's misfortunes. Mr. Smith, it is true, is represented as urging Miss Wyman to break off her engagement because the apostle forbids us "to be unequally yoked [together] with unbelievers; or, at least, to suspend her consent until her intended husband had renounced his infidelity." Miss Wyman herself gives the following account of the matter: "To you, do my best, I must, unless you should be converted to religion, soon appear a weak and silly woman. My religious zeal will be in your estimation mere fanaticism, and my love to God will seem so much abstracted from that which you will claim as due to yourself.

Difference of belief will lead to difference of feeling, to a difference of tastes, and aims, and then to coldness, neglect, perhaps disgust and mutual wretchedness. With views of religion so widely different as ours are, we can never enjoy that union of soul which we should both crave, and without which we could not be happy." But when our author gives us, in his own words, the reason for his heroine's conduct, we find it entirely different from both the above. It is in these words: "She had just dedicated herself to God; she must be his and his only. Did she not owe every thing to God? Should she not love him with her whole heart, and ought she not to sacrifice every thing to him? Was not religion in its very nature a sacrifice? Would she not be violating its most solemn injunctions, if she retained any thing which she loved more than God? Did she not in fact love me more than him? I was dearer to her than all the world beside; but, then, would not the sacrifice of me to God be so much the more meritorious?" According, therefore, to our author's own showing, Miss Wyman did not act from the motive suggested by Mr. Smith, and, really, to our seeming, her own account of the affair is the only piece of common sense in the history of the whole transaction.

But let us look at this work from the other point of view. Suppose that the persons introduced are all imaginary, and that without any intention of designating persons, our author merely desires to represent classes at present existing in society. The question then arises, Are these representations true? Let us take Charles Elwood as the representative of atheists, the *priests*, Smith and Wilson, as the representatives of those classes of clergymen who believe in the existence of revivals, and George Wyman as the representative of laymen of the same belief, and let us ask, Are these delineations faithful pictures of these several classes of our fellow-citizens?

Charles Elwood is a man "yearning for communion with his kind, ever ready to sympathize with them in their joy or their sorrow," "unconscious of guilt," "having a strong craving to know the truth, and feeling that he had done his best to ascertain it;" "he is gentle and forgiving, has been often known to risk his life for his enemies;" most devoutly desirous of rendering all men good and happy, and making the world "resound with



the songs of liberty, joy and peace;" full, moreover, of generous affection, he would love and be loved, "he would love not the race only, but some one dearer than all to cheer him on to the combat and welcome his return." Such is the character of atheism, our author being judge.

Let us now turn, for a moment, to the character of clergymen, of the revival-loving sects. "Mr. Smith was, in the main, an honest and well-meaning man, who, impressed with the importance of saving his soul, had failed to take enlarged views of men and things,"—*quere*, Do these stand in the relation of cause and effect?—"educated by charity, gratitude to his sect had quickened his zeal and narrowed his sympathies;" he had "been so accustomed to dwell on another world, to see a material and burning hell before him, that this world and all the social feelings and duties which belong to it had nearly lost all hold upon his conscience and his heart," "in his heart he would be, and doubtless thought himself, little less than an angel of God, but he passed through society over the domestic hearth, a minister of wrath scattering blight and death." This man obtrudes himself into the company of Miss Wyman, and wrenches from her the thoughts of her inmost spirit, and authoritatively forbids her marriage with the hero of our tale. And our author takes pains to put us in mind that this is no fancy sketch, but that some of its most revolting incidents correspond to what he knows to be matters of fact.

"This must seem to my readers a mere fancy sketch, for I presume such conversations do not take place in these days; but they were very common when I was a young man. One of the most common methods resorted to by revivalists was to make the love which a young man had for a young woman, and the love he hoped for in return, the means of his conversion to the church. My own case was not a singular one. The girl was instructed to throw her arms around her lover's neck, and entreat him, by all his affection for her, to join the church; but at the same time to assure him, that she could never consent to be his unless he gave evidences of conversion. There was some knowledge of human nature in this, and these fair apostles were not unfrequently successful as well as eloquent pleaders for God, especially when seconded by the burning passions of their youthful admirers."

Let us take another specimen. Mr. Wilson was another priest, whose "intellectual powers were respectable, his *religious feelings* strong and active, and his *moral sentiments* weak and sluggish; he would never enter a church

without taking off his hat ;"—what there is in this peculiar to any one but a Quaker we do not perceive,—“but he could pass a poor widow without thinking of her wants; he would do much for evangelizing the world and converting it to his creed, but very little for civilizing it and making the earth the abode of love and peace; but whatever he was, he *contrived* to throw a veil of sanctity over the unseemly features of his character, and to pass himself off with the multitude as a saint of the first water.” Of the intellectual character of these personages, it is needless to speak. Suffice it to say, that they are beaten, routed, ground to powder, in every conflict with our hero.

But this is not all. We have next the portraiture of five or six of Mr. Wilson's brother clergymen. “Their faces, as grave as a church-yard, showed a becoming horror at my approach.” They “scarcely greeted Mr. Elwood with a single civil word; they looked up to heaven and sighed, hung down their heads and were silent.” They call him a fool, accuse him of falsehood, and when he had left them, held the following edifying conversation with each other. “They looked at one another and smiled; that young man, said one of them, would make a most capital preacher were he only on the right side. Perhaps, said another, he is nearer right than we should be willing the world should believe. Never mind, said still another, *the people are superstitious; they will have some kind of worship; and we must let them have their own way. These reverend gentlemen, it seems, understood one another.*”

Now, if these portraits are intended to represent the clergy of New England, we must be pardoned if we declare, that a grosser libel was never written, and we fearlessly appeal to the whole world for the truth of what we say. We know that a clergyman may prove himself a villain and a hypocrite; he may be imbecile, ignorant and obtrusive; but we ask fearlessly, Is such the character of the clergy of New England or of Protestantism in general? We have been, during a short life, in habits of intercourse with clergymen of almost every religious sect, and we never have known such men as these pages portray. They have their imperfections as a class; they are generally less zealous and laborious, less studious and less in earnest than they should be; they have too little of the *esprit du*

*corps*; are frequently womanish and fidgety; but they honestly believe what they preach; they are men of irreproachable lives; they honestly labor to render men better, and they do manifestly succeed in their efforts; instead of embittering neighborhoods and fomenting strifes, they are emphatically ministers of peace; they do not do as much as they ought, but what they do is kindly done; and Charles Elwood cannot point to a town or a village in this whole land, of which the moral and social character has not been improved, when, to their other means of improvement, they have added that of the ministration of these very priests. But why do we appeal to such instances? These clergymen are our fathers, our brethren, our children, our intimate associates. There is scarcely a respectable citizen among us who is not the personal friend of some member of this profession. Let such men speak, if they have known clergymen such as our author has described. They may have laughed at the ignorance of the world which marks so frequently the plans of the priesthood, or at the awkwardness which often leads them into strange embarrassments, but they have not found them false, heartless, mischievous, or morally unsound. The whole question, however, is easily settled by a single fact. Let an American citizen be unexpectedly cast a stranger upon the mercies of his fellow-men, let the stage coach leave him by accident, or let him lame his horse by a fall, or let him be suddenly attacked by disease, in a region where his name has never yet been spoken, and the man whom he will instinctively inquire after, as the person most likely to sympathize in his misfortune, and solace him with his society, and extend to him the rites of hospitality, is the clergyman of the district. We thus learn what such have found by experience to be the character of the *priests*.

Our author himself ascribes to the priesthood great influence over their fellow-men. But the citizens of this land are proverbially shrewd, intelligent, clear-sighted, independent, and free. To suppose such clergymen as he describes, capable of exerting the influence which he concedes to them, is strongly at variance with common sense. Nor is this all. The supposition itself is a reproach upon the character of our country. Pope asks, what must the people be when a monkey is the God? We ask, what

must the people be, who could be led about and befooled by such men as Mr. Smith, Mr. Wilson, and their five or six brother clergymen in Mr. Wilson's study?

We have marked several passages to illustrate the singular bitterness which comes over our author's spirit whenever he has occasion to speak of the church, or Christianity as it is commonly understood. But enough of this. We are delaying already too long on this part of our subject. Let us proceed to examine briefly the views of *society* and *social reformation* set forth in the work before us.

Charles Elwood, it seems, after his matrimonial disappointment, was for a long time without object or aim. He was, of course, miserable, and he wandered over the earth, displeased with himself and with every thing about him. At length, beholding the social miseries of man, he determined to attempt a reformation. We are happy here to insert a passage containing a noble sentiment expressed with great force and beauty; and we commend it to our readers, of all classes and conditions, specially to those who are troubled about their *nerves*, while they are surrounded with all that heart can desire.

"Now I had found a purpose, an end, an aim,—a future, and began to live again. No more whimpering, no more sickly sentimentalism; I was a man now, and had a man's work before me. I might stand alone against a hostile world, but what of that? I felt I had that within me, which was more than a match for all the forces it could muster against me; I carried a whole world within me, infinitely superior to the world without me, and which should ere-long replace it. O, ye, who whimper and whine over your petty miseries, go forth into the world, behold the wrongs and outrages to which man subjects his brother, and seek to arrest them: so shall you forget your own puny sorrows, and find the happiness ye sigh for."

Let us first contemplate the state of society, as it revealed itself to the eye of our hero:

"Wherever I went I beheld injustice, oppression, inequality in wealth, social position, moral and intellectual culture,—the many every where toiling for the few. Here is a man well made, with vigorous body and active limbs, an intellect capable of grappling with the weightiest problems of science, and a heart of loving all things which are beautiful and good; and yet he is compelled to toil and rack his brains from morning to night, in order to gain the bare means of subsistence, which shall after all be infinitely inferior to the fare of the rich man's dog. Wealth is every where, in practice at least, counted the supreme good, and every where its producers are the poor and wretched. They who toil not, spin not, are they who are clad in soft raiment, and fare sumptuously every day. What monstrous injustice is here!



"Here are priests, statesmen, lawyers, all boasting their services, and pretending to manage society as it ought to be managed. But what do they for the mass, the great, unprivileged, hard-handed many? A rich man is murdered, and the whole community rises to ferret out the murderer; a poor man is murdered, leaving a wife and children to the tender mercies of a heartless world, and no questions are asked. Mothers, pale and emaciated, watch the live-long night over their starving little ones; young women are driven by poverty to prostitution; young men are becoming thieves, robbers, murderers, that they may not waste away in absolute want, unknown and unhonored. On every hand vice and crime, and wailing and wo; and the vice and crime of the poor alone exciting horror, and the wailing and wo of the rich alone calling forth commiseration. O, it is a bad world. Society is all wrong. These iniquitous distinctions of class, this injustice, this oppression of the toiling many to feed the luxury and the vanity of the idle and worse than useless few, must be redressed."

Such is the view of Charles Elwood. His oracle, Mr. Howard, utters the same sentiments in a somewhat different form:

"The favored few may be enlightened, cultivated, refined; but the many are almost uniformly ignorant, half-brutish, and shut out from nearly all the advantages society was instituted by the Creator to secure to its members. The splendid palaces rise side by side with the wretched hovels of the poor. They may be filled with every luxury for every sense, wrung from the toil and sweat of the mass; but their occupants, notwithstanding their intelligence, refinement and hospitality, seem never to have dreamed that the many were not made for the express purpose of ministering to their pleasure; and on their benighted minds dawns never the great doctrine of the common brotherhood of the race. I sometimes lost my patience. I told a judge one day that I would rather take my chance at the last day, with those he would hang than with himself. They were victims of an order of things they had not created, and could not control: of which he was one of the feed upholders. Instead of using the talents and means of influence God had entrusted to him, for the melioration of that order, he exerted them merely to crush whomsoever should dare disclose its defects or seek to remedy them.

"I have now returned home, and here, I am sorry to say, I find the germs of the same order, the same principles and tendencies at work, and if resulting as yet in evils of less magnitude, it is owing to certain accidental causes, every day becoming less and less active. The lines of distinction between the great mass of the people and the favored few, are every day becoming broader and more indelible. Labor is held in less esteem than it was, and is not so well rewarded. Wages, perhaps, are nominally higher, the laboring man may consume more and richer articles of food and clothing; but if I am not greatly mistaken, he finds it more than proportionally more difficult to maintain his former relative standing. Poverty keeps pace with wealth, and not unfrequently outruns it. Poor men may indeed become rich, and rich men poor; but the rich and poor still remain; the perpetual shifting of

individuals leaves the classes as they were, neither lessening their numbers nor diminishing their evil consequences. The evil does not consist in the fact that these individuals rather than those, constitute the rich or the poor, but in the fact that there are both rich and poor."

On this statement of the condition of society, we have a few remarks with which we shall trouble our readers.

In the first place, we demur as to the facts here set forth. We utterly deny that such is the state of society in this country, that it ever has been, and it would require a more veritable prophet than Charles Elwood to convince us that it ever would be. That there are instances of individual oppression, of infamous perversion of justice, of galling, unmitigated poverty, and of ruin of character, arising from these causes, no one is so foolish as to deny. But these are the exceptions, instead of the general rule; and we will add, they are the rare and uncommon exceptions. We have had, during the course of our short life, considerable intercourse with the poor of two generations; that is, the poor as parents, and the poor as children. We bear testimony in full to the entire opposite of all that our author alleges. We have seen the rich cower before the poor, as often as the poor cower before the rich. We have never yet seen,—we say it with pride,—we have never yet seen a native laboring American who did not feel himself every inch a man. And if our author has ever seen one on whose rights, were he so disposed, he would dare to trample, he has been less fortunate in his society than we. We have been, to a greater extent than many others, acquainted with young men who, with no other reliance under God than their own head and their own right hand, without hereditary influence or backers of any kind whatever, have committed themselves to the current of active life. Of these, we have never known a single one to fail from any cause external to himself. We have never known an outward force keep a single man from rising. We have never seen honest, virtuous industry fail of its reward, unless from some of those inscrutable dispensations of Providence by which we are taught that

"There's a Divinity that shapes our ends,  
Rough hew them as we will."

We say it is so, and, more than this, we say that it is an insult to our country to deny it. We ask, could such

a state of society as our author describes, exist, and the yeomanry of New England not perceive it and redress it? Are the working men of our land a class to be humbugged? Would they for a moment endure a galling tyranny, such as is here said to bear sway over them? They would consider such an assertion as a personal insult. We speak what we really believe, when we say that, put aside partisan excitement, and the *exaltation* produced by political animosity, and no man would dare to collect the working men of a town in New England, and tell them that they were oppressed in the manner that our author here and elsewhere sets forth. They would very soon let him know that, though their hands were hard, their hearts were whole, and they were not to be rated by any man as slaves.

But let us consider the gist of this charge against society. It is, in essence, this, that some men are poor and others rich, some occupy a higher position in the eyes of their fellow-men than others, and some possess superior intellectual advantages to others. Thus says our author in the passage which we have quoted, "Wherever I went I beheld injustice, oppression, inequality in wealth, social position, moral and intellectual culture." We are here given to understand that inequality of wealth belongs to the same category of crime as injustice and oppression. Again: "Society is all wrong. These iniquitous distinctions of class,"—by-the-by, we do not understand what this means,—"this injustice, this oppression of the toiling many to feed the luxury of the idle and worse than useless few, must be redressed." To the same effect, also, is Mr. Morton's dictum:

"Poor men may indeed become rich, and rich men poor, but the rich and the poor still remain; the perpetual shifting of individuals leaves the classes as they were, neither lessening their numbers nor diminishing their evil consequences. The *evil does not consist in the fact that these individuals rather than those constitute the rich or the poor, but in the fact that there are both rich and poor.*"

Now, on this subject we would remark, in the first place, we like not the spirit which is here exhibited to the poor themselves. All this seems to go upon the supposition that it is a disgrace to be poor, that if a man is poor he is an object of pity, that labor is a curse, that a hand inured to oil is a badge of servitude and an indication of

meanness. And it is remarkable that, while our author rails at the age for considering wealth the supreme good, he manifestly so considers it himself, since he clearly holds forth poverty as the most bitter of all possible sublunary inflictions.

Now, with all this we have no manner of sympathy. We are, through and through, republicans. We have been poor, and are not far removed from it now; but we never felt it to be a disgrace, nor do we blush here publicly to speak of it. We do not consider labor—personal, physical labor, the labor of the spade, the plough, the hoe,—a bitter infliction. We are thankful to God that he has thus made us, and that he has connected so many blessings with the toil of the body. Nor do we speak on the subject as theorists. We write these pages after returning drenched in perspiration from the labors of the field, with the thermometer at almost 90°. In all this we feel no degradation. And in our intercourse with other men, the grasp of a hard hand sends a thrill of pleasure along our nerves which they never experience from the grasp of a soft one. It tells us of independence, of sobriety, of forecast, of full and well developed manfulness, which can never be attained by the gloved and scented underlings of Broadway or of Bond street. We are far too republican in our notions to sympathize with any philosophy which does not look at the *laborer* as the *peer* of any other man in the realm.

But, again. The results of this grievous, and, to an American, unnatural error,—an error which we could scarcely forgive, had not our author addicted himself so much to French literature, and formed his conceptions rather from foreign description than from home observation,—are immediately evident. He assures us that society is all wrong, for the simple reason that there exist rich and poor. It is granted that there *is nothing to prevent* the rich from becoming poor and the poor from becoming rich; but all is wrong, because this is *allowed*,—because society permits such changes to take place, and any distinctions among men, either in physical or intellectual condition, to exist.

Now, in regard to this view of society, we have but little to say. In the first place, however, we are struck with the anti-republican assumption on which it is founded.



Republicanism proceeds upon the principle that every individual is a distinct and proper man, *totus teres et rotundus*, endowed by his Creator with all the powers necessary for self-government and self-improvement, and that society must not interfere with him in the just exercise of these powers. He may use them well or ill, and, provided he injure not his neighbor, he may work out his own weal or wo, and society holds herself not responsible. Republicanism looks first of all to individual freedom, and therefore she admits into her system, with great caution, any element by which that freedom may be abridged. She seeks for freedom, not for *one party* or *class*, but for all men. She knows no man either as poor or rich, she knows him only as a *man*, and, as such, she throws over him the ægis of her protection. Hence she is as careful to guard him from oppression by the many, as from oppression by the few. She guarantees to every man the opportunity of seeking his own happiness in his own way, and of using, as well as he is able, the benefits which God has given him; but she will go no farther. She assumes no responsibility for the wealth or the poverty of one class or of another, for the assumption of responsibility always involves the possession of power. If society, or the majority, assume the responsibility of *providing* for the poor, they also must claim the right of *disposing* of them, and thus the poor man is degraded at once from the condition of a freeman to that of a serf. Extremes, they say, frequently meet. We hope that Charles Elwood himself was not aware how strongly his notions were at variance with the elementary doctrines of republicanism, and how accurately they symbolized with those of despotism. The despots tell us that they are the *fathers* of their people, and are bound to provide for them; and what provision they make, we need not be informed. Our author makes *society* the parent, and he would have it hold precisely the same relation to the people as the despot holds. Republicanism is equally at variance with both systems, and considers each man, after he becomes of age, as able to take care of himself.

Again. We are struck with the glaring inconsistency which exists between the views of Charles Elwood and the most elementary principles of man's social nature. It is evident that our Creator intended this world for the

formation of moral character. He has subjected us all to various modes of trial. To some he has committed wealth, to others poverty. He has given to every one the powers suited to his nature and condition, and has subjected us all to laws which we may obey or disobey, as we please. The man who obeys the laws of his Creator reaps the reward, while he who disobeys them must suffer the punishment; and it is obviously right that it should be so. The best training for any man is to be obliged to reap the results of his own actions. And it is for this reason, by-the-by, that the sons of the rich are so frequently ruined. Their parents are able to screen them from the results of their conduct, while habits of vice are *forming*; but soon they become formed, and the parent can help the child no longer; an explosion ensues, and the *young gentleman*, when the smoke blows away, emerges a *loafer* for life.

Now, we hold that to be the truest conception of the social state, which allows these laws of divine Providence, with the least interruption, to have their free and unbiased effect. Let society secure to a man the opportunity of laboring when he pleases, where he pleases, and for what compensation he can command; let it insure to him the entire disposal of whatever he may gain; let it resolutely vindicate the rights of all, both the high and the low, and then let society stand out of the way. If a man be indolent, or intemperate, or profligate, or sensual, or shiftless, he will very likely be quickened in his march by the sharp pinches of poverty; to our notion, a very suitable discipline. Let him squander his gains in vice, and he will soon have nothing left to squander. Let him be frugal, and virtuous, and industrious, and both he and his children will, day by day, reap the rewards which Providence has connected with virtue.

To all this our author objects. To him it is a grievance that there should be rich and poor, that there should be social distinctions. That is, if we understand it, he would have all men, wise and unwise, honest men and rogues, industrious and indolent, thoughtful and thoughtless, selfish and patriotic, noble and mean, fare just alike, share in the blessings of Providence in equal measure, and equally be distinguished by the respect and affection of their fellow-citizens. This is going pretty far, even for a reformer.

Our author, in the work before us, does not unfold the means by which he supposes this happy consummation is to be effected. He, however, if we mistake not, gives us reason to expect that he shall ere-long disclose the secret on which the well-being of mankind so essentially depends. This has of late been done; and we are informed at last of the method by which all men, good and bad, indolent and industrious, frugal and extravagant, are to be brought to the measure of this Procrustean equality.

The first of them is, the destruction of the priesthood. In the words of our author,

"The remedy is first to be sought in the destruction of the priest. We delight not in pulling down, but the bad must be removed before the good can be introduced." "The priest is universally a tyrant; universally the enslaver of his brethren. The complete and final destruction of the priestly order in every *practical* sense of the word priest, is the first step to be taken towards elevating the laboring classes."

The second means is the destruction of banks!

"Uncompromising hostility to the whole banking system should, therefore, be the motto of every working man and every friend of humanity. The system must be destroyed. On this point there must be no misgivings, no subterfuges, no palliation. Every friend of the system must be *marked as an enemy to his race*, to his country, and especially to the laborer. No matter who he is, in what party he is found, or what name he bears, he is, in our judgment, no true *democrat*, as he can be no true *Christian*."

This is rather particularly amiable!

The third means for accomplishing this reformation is to complete the work by abolishing hereditary property:

"A man shall have all he honestly acquires so long as he himself belongs to the world in which he acquires it. But his power over his property *must cease with his life*. And his property must then become the property of the State, to be disposed of by some *equitable* (?) law, for the use of the generation which takes his place."

And let it be remembered, that this is effected by a change in our *social state*. Our author himself, also, is aware that this revolution cannot be accomplished without bloodshed by wholesale. He tells us:

"It will be effected only by the strong hand of physical force. It will come, if it ever come at all, *ONLY* at the conclusion of a war *the like of which the world as yet has never witnessed*, and from which, however inevitable it may seem to the eye of *philosophy*, the heart of *humanity* recoils with horror."\*

---

\* Boston Review, art., *Laboring Classes*. July, 1840.

The great opponents to this work of reform, according to our author, are the yeomanry,—the *middling interest* of the country. He says:

"This *middle class*, which was strong enough to defeat nearly all the practical *benefit* of the *French Revolution*, is the natural enemy of the Chartists. Our despair for the poor Chartists arises from the number and power of the *middle class*. We dread for them neither the monarchy nor the nobility. Their only real enemy is the employer. *In all countries it is the same.* The only enemy of the *laborer* is your employer, whether appearing in the shape of the *master mechanic*, or in [that of] the *owner of a factory.*"

We have here, then, developed in detail, the author's conception of the perfection of the social state. We are to have a civil war, "the like of which the world has never seen," and it has seen some *tolerably* sanguinary civil wars. The object of this *movement* is, to sweep away with one fell swoop the whole middling interest, and then establish a *government* which should exercise despotic power over the *ordinances of religion*, the *rights of conscience*, and the possession of property; that is, which should permit the majority, for the time being, to ride rough shod over the minority, unchecked by any restraint but the law of the strongest. This is the boon which our author coolly offers to the citizens of New England, under the name of liberty.

It would at once occur to every reader, that these notions could never have *originated* in the bosom of a native-born American. This vulture-like snuffing up the scent of carnage; this savage scalp-scream at the prospect of butchery; and this glazing the matter over with the name of philosophy, belongs not to the Anglo-Saxon heart. At first, we were at a loss to account for the source of all these abominations. The mystery was, however, unexpectedly revealed, when, by accident, we opened "France, its Court and King,"—a work said to be written by a distinguished American resident at the court of Versailles. We here find that these same ideas have, in certain circles, been for some time prevalent in France; and it would seem that we are indebted to our author, not for originating them, but only for introducing them to our notice, enforced by his own explanation and illustrations.

It is well known that, in the year 1839, a conspiracy to overturn the government was detected in Paris.



"Its disclosures furnish an entirely new chapter in the progress of modern civilization, and exhibit the social and political condition of France in the most sombre colors.

"The judicial proceedings disclose the existence of certain secret societies, and also their machinery, principles and objects. Their organization appears to have been well adapted to the ulterior designs of the party. Candidates were admitted with prescribed ceremonies, tending to produce a powerful impression upon their imaginations. They were *required to propagate their principles*, to make no confessions if interrogated by the authorities, *to execute without reply the orders of the chiefs*, to furnish themselves with arms and ammunition, and carefully to avoid writing upon the subject of the association. At the initiation, a series of questions and answers passed between the President and the candidate, which disclose the objects of the association and the means it proposes to employ. This political catechism is a mixture of the *wildest fanaticism* and the most *frightful cruelty*, and reveals a state of feeling and an aberration of principle, and I might almost add of reason, *wholly unknown*(?) in our calmer and happier country. Some of these questions and answers are the following.

"*Question.* Is a *political or social* revolution necessary?

"*Answer.* A social revolution. The social state being gangrened, to arrive at a state of health, requires *heroic remedies*; the people will have need, during some time, of revolutionary power.' What is meant by *heroic remedies* and a *revolutionary power*, may be learned in the history of France during the despotism of Robespierre. A social revolution means the *destruction of all the rights of property*.

"*Question.* Who are now the aristocrats?

"*Answer.* They are the men of property, *bankers*, furnishers, monopolists, large proprietors, brokers, in a word, land holders, who fatten at the expense of the people.

"*Question.* Those who have rights without fulfilling duties, like the *aristocrats* of the present day, do they make *part* of the people?

"*Answer.* They *ought not to make part of the people*. They are, to the social body, what the cancer is to the natural body. The first condition of the return of the body to health, is the *extirpation of the cancer*. The first condition of the return of the social body to a just state, is the *annihilation of the aristocracy*; or, in more decent though not plainer terms, *the death of all who possess property*."

It seems that this association secretly circulated among themselves a newspaper containing the more complete development of their doctrines. In one of the publications, called "*The Formulary of the Democratic Phalanxes*," it is announced that the candidate ought to take the oath to destroy and to contribute to the *triumph of the equality of the social condition*, founded upon the *equal division of all the products of the earth and industry*.

Again, the same journal declares we want now more than changes of men. It (the press) ought to say, all that is connected with *religious worship is contrary to our*

*progress*; while at the same time whenever people are *religious they talk nonsense*.

As to the means relied on for the accomplishment of this benevolent design we are fortunately not left in darkness. This same journal informs us :

"There is, then, but a single resource, to employ regicide, tyrannicide, assassination, as they would term this *heroic* action."

Again :

"Yes, he who is chosen for holy\* homicide, if his life has been tarnished with thefts and assassinations, will become free from spot and clear from all infamy, as soon as he shall have washed himself with the blood of kings. O Virtue, the poniard, sole hope of the earth, where is thy sacred arm, when the thunder suffers crimes to reign."

We behold, then, in the papers of this benevolent association the germs of all the ideas advocated by our author. The source of the evil is the inequality of property; the great opponents to reform, the land-holders and middle class; the changes necessary to be effected, the abolition of all religious worship, the annihilation of the right of property; the means by which this is to be effected, "a war the like of which the world has never seen," the butchery of the middle class, and the free use of the poniard, "the sacred arm of virtue." There does not seem a single idea in the one theory that does not find its counterpart in the other. We blush to think that an American citizen, one officially connected, as he tells us, with the republican party, which means, we presume, that he is enjoying the comforts of a lucrative office under the very constitution which he would trample in the dust, should have ever given utterance to such infamous trash. The only excuse which we can make for him, and we believe it to be true, is, that bedazzled by the glare of French Eclecticism, he has adopted French revolutionary notions, without being aware of their tendency. We commend them to his sober *second thought*.

We had intended to bestow a passing notice upon our author's religious notions, but we have already occupied

---

\* In the name of our mother English, we beg leave to put in a plea in behalf of this much abused word. In the English of good usage, *holy* means *pious*, consecrated to God; and can be ascribed to nothing but the *moral* affections of the spirit; and, by way of eminence, to the attributes of the Deity. What may be its meaning in German, or French, or the Orphic dialect, we know not. In the English tongue, however, we cannot correctly apply it to the natural affections, to hyacinths, or Brandreth's pills, to chlorine thunder, or ginseng.

a greater number of pages than we intended, and here we must pause. We would only add, by way of information, that our author's religious notions are as wide of the Christianity of the New Testament as his social notions are of the republicanism of the Constitution.

A word or two of advice to Charles Elwood, and we have done.

1st. In behalf of the working classes of New England, we beg leave to decline the boon which he offers them. They are industrious men, and they have no fancy for a system which should squander their honest gains upon the idle and the profligate. They are independent men, able and willing to clear a way for themselves by honest labor; they consider the offer to make them stipendiaries of government, to support them from their neighbor's crib, as no compliment. They are intelligent men, and it sounds strange to them to be told that their condition is worse than that of the serfs of Russia or the slaves of Cuba.

2d. Our author informs us, that his first attempt to create a social revolution failed for want of combining with it a religious element. This difficulty he now, it seems, intends to obviate, by using the name of the Christian religion as a fulcrum, and persuading the Christian community that the religion which they profess leads to, nay, demands, the social state which he so warmly recommends, and asserts that he who does not adopt these views is "no true democrat, as he can be no true Christian." So also the regicides of France denominate the Saviour of the world, "the *democratic* son of Mary." In like manner, our author intersperses his declamation with many phrases peculiar to Christianity, as though he used them in the same sense as Christians. This is the old device of Catholicism; to render religion the handmaid of tyranny. In an ignorant age, and when the Bible was concealed from the laity, it succeeded, but it could not stand a moment before the freedom of the press. With the Bible open before men, neither our author nor Cousin can make it speak the language of Eclecticism, or of such a despotism as our author would prefer. We think that this part of his effort must be a failure, and we advise him to turn his attention in some other direction.

And lastly. If Charles Elwood sees any case of wrong in the system as it now is, let him bring it forth to light

and see that it be redressed upon principle. Or, if he believes the theory of our government to be wrong, let him address himself to the understanding and conscience of men; and thus persuade his fellow-citizens to modify or abolish it. These appeals to the fears of men, these threats of bloodshed and butchery, prove nothing. Men are not so easily frightened as he may imagine. In nothing are we more liable to deceive ourselves than in the estimate of our power of intimidation. For ourselves, we make no special pretensions to bravery, yet our nerves are not particularly moved by the threat of assassination. Were the guillotine before our eyes, we should despise the tyranny which he denominates liberty as thoroughly as we do at this moment. And one thing more, we should much prefer that "heroic remedy," as the French regicides call it, to the thralldom of Charles Elwood's political reformation. This sort of talk does not prove any thing, and it may as well be dropped. The author may look upon it as prophecy, but it is liable to create the impression that he would be pleased to see his prophecy fulfilled. This we do not believe for a moment, and we therefore advise him to predict on some other subject.

---

#### ARTICLE VIII.

##### INFLUENCE OF MOTHERS.

WITHIN a few years, some of the ablest pens have been employed in writing on the condition, duties and rights of woman. Even the titles of the works, which on these subjects have been issued from the press, have been so attractive as to secure some readers. We have had, "Woman as she should be," "Woman in her Social and Domestic character," "The Women of England, their Social duties and Domestic habits," "Woman's Mission," and to bring up the rear, we have had by Lady Blessington, "Woman and her Master." Most of these volumes are the productions of females, and are in the highest degree creditable to their talents and virtue. With the excep-



tion of Lady Blessington's work, which we confess we have not read with sufficient attention to pass a just sentence upon it, we would cordially recommend the books we have named to the perusal of our fair friends whether married or unmarried. We may add to these the *Mother's Monthly Journal*, a periodical devoted to the noblest of purposes,—one which has from the beginning deservedly received the warmest approbation, and which continues with unabating zeal and success to exhibit the importance, and facilitate the right exercise, of maternal influence. Nor can we withhold our commendation from a kindred journal, the *Mother's Magazine*, in which we seldom fail to discover the results of mature experience, wisdom and piety combined.

We regret to say, that there are individuals in our land, who, claiming to be wiser than the inspired writers, are laboring to make females dissatisfied with their present position in society. They would fain elevate her, as they suppose, by assigning her duties, and placing her in public stations which hitherto, in our happy country, man only has discharged and occupied. We will not impeach the motives of these professed friends of social reform. They may, for aught we know to the contrary, have the happiness and dignity of woman in view. They may think they are doing *her* service. However kind their intentions may be, we believe that they are altogether mistaken; and that evils innumerable and not to be named, would arise, were a general attempt made to reduce their theory to practice. The trumpeters of these new doctrines are generally those who are strangers to maternal feelings, whose hearts were never gladdened by the pleasures, nor oppressed with the responsibilities, of that sacred relation.

We cannot doubt that woman's proper sphere is Home. Her tender frame, and delicate structure of mind, giving her more sensibility, and less of vigor and robustness, indicate the station for which she was designed by her beneficent Creator. She was never intended by Providence for the bar, the senate chamber, or the pulpit. Those who would elevate her, by pushing her into the arena of public life, are not aware of the gulf of misery and degradation into which they would plunge her. Woman's greatest power over the heart of man is in her meek and gentle demeanor,—not in her mingling in

the noise of strife and debate. Her timid reserve is her strong fortress. If she lose this, the spoiler will come, and the ruin of her innocence will be almost inevitable. So great a blight never yet came over the morals of the nation as would be witnessed, were the "Rights of Woman," as advocated by some modern visionaries, realized. Were she to leave the quiet scenes of domestic life, and engage in public or political contests, she would cease to be loved and respected by man. She would become a rival instead of a companion, and an object of envy, of contempt and hate. Bereft of her own native modesty, she would associate with the vile, and become the victim of the lowest impulses and passions.

It was the design of the Creator that woman should be a help-meet for man; not by taking his place or performing his rougher and more public duties, but by offices more suited to her feminine nature. By her personal presence, her neatness, her amiable deportment, her assiduous attentions, her confiding love, she makes home an asylum, a quiet resting-place, a delightful retreat from the labors, the perplexities and disturbing scenes which her husband experiences abroad. He needs this repose. He needs to meet eyes which beam upon him with gladness as he enters his own dwelling, and to have *one* friend at least to whom he can trust all his thoughts, his cares, his joys, his plans. God has provided him with this sweet friend in woman. Her physical and mental powers are different from man's; that she may be qualified by tenderness and love, and a confiding spirit, to soothe his cares and increase his joys. Her sphere, then, is home, and no plea of superior piety, or regard for the public good, should ever cause her unseasonably to leave her station. She should never leave her husband to brood over his cares alone, or cause him to suspect that she prefers the society of others to him; she should feel, with Milton, that,

"Nothing lovelier can be found  
In woman, than to study household good,  
And good works in her husband to promote ;"

and if she have children committed to her care, she is especially called upon in the providence of God to watch over their interests,—to be their nurse in infancy,—to

instruct their uninformed minds, and to fashion their morals and manners. These are the appropriate labors of the mother. It is to induce mothers to be contented with their own proper station as one of great honor and utility, and to encourage them in their discharge of maternal duties, that we have taken up our pen.

The prophet Ezekiel alludes to maternal influence as a well established fact, when he says, "As is the mother so is her daughter." Of the power of a mother's *example* in forming the character of her daughters, we have no doubt. This power may not be so great now as anciently, because then, daughters were almost exclusively confined to the society of their mothers. They were not sent abroad to be educated. Whatever of instruction they received was in their mother's apartment. When their minds were soft and pliant, ready to receive any impression, their mother was at hand to produce that impression, and for the most part she left the image of her own character on her child. So will it generally be, when daughters are placed within (not without) the circle of a mother's influence. If she be amiable, discreet, a keeper at home; if she be chaste, meek, gentle, fearing God; if she control her own temper, guarding against impatience, and uncharitable speaking of those who are absent, inculcating and encouraging these Christian virtues in her own children, discountenancing and restraining infirmities of temper, and all evil speaking against others; her children will become assimilated to her own habits.

And if the reverse of this be the case,—if there be no discretion, no control of the tongue or the temper, no regard for truth-speaking or kindness,—if there be no daily exhibition of what is lovely or of good report on the part of the mother, it may be expected that her daughters will be like her. There always have been honorable and happy exceptions. Daughters have risen superior to the unlovely examples witnessed at home. And there have been also *unhappy* exceptions. The example of an amiable and discreet mother has been disregarded. But the general fact has been, and is, "As is the mother so is her daughter;" and in this connection we would remark, that too much importance is attached to grave and formal lectures delivered to children, and too little to that imperceptible but genial and wonder-working influence, a con-

sistent and beautiful course of life. The reason may be, it is easy once in a long season to utter a long and solemn speech to a child; but it requires constant effort to maintain that symmetry of conduct which commands love and respect and will insure imitation. Instruction is good; but example is better. The precepts of a mother may have a happy effect; but the daily, living illustration of what is proper in temper, pure and elevated in conversation, and estimable in conduct, will be productive of far happier results. We are all governed more readily and effectually by example than by precept, and the young feel the power of example more than the aged; and more than any other they feel the power of a mother's example.

Children may not be able to understand an argument, or to remember a long story or an address; but they can comprehend an invariable regard for the truth, patience under trials and provocations, kindness to the poor, modesty of demeanor, contentedness with the allotments of Providence, and perseverance in overcoming difficulties, as embodied and illustrated in a mother's daily conduct. Nor is this all. They not only comprehend a mother's conduct, better than they possibly could any formal lessons, but so far as it is imitable they imitate it. Their filial love secures their imitation. She is to them an object of their earliest and tenderest affection. They feel an undoubting trust in her superior wisdom and experience. What she does must, in their judgment, be right. They reverence her opinions without inquiring whether they are founded in reason, in revelation, or in fancy. We see, then, the influences in view of which the casual remark passed into a proverb, "*As is the mother so is her daughter.*"

It is beyond dispute, that the influence of a mother is exceedingly great. To her more than to the father is intrusted the *character* of children, and especially that of daughters. The father, indeed, is not released from the obligation of watching over the interests and character of his children. It is his duty to command his children and his household after him to keep the statutes of the Lord. But he cannot, if he would, exert that bland and yet powerful influence in forming the character of his children which the mother puts forth. Providence has



settled this question. Each parent has clearly defined duties. The father is qualified by a more athletic frame for the hard and adventurous labor by which the family is to be supported. His vocation is abroad. The mother is equally and obviously designed to be in the midst of her children. To her is committed the nourishment of her infant offspring, the moulding of their tempers, the formation of their earliest habits, and the development of their earliest thoughts and desires. In fulfilling these maternal offices, she awakens a love in her child towards its mother which can never be felt for a father. The emotions and sensibilities, called into action by a mother's fond ministrations, invest her example and instructions with a charm not to be resisted. And the soft and gentle tones of a mother's voice sink more deeply into the young heart, than the rough and stern voice of paternal authority. The example of a mother cannot fail of being imitated. Her faults will be as likely to be copied as her virtues.

This is no picture of the imagination. It is drawn from real life. In ten thousand happy, as well as unhappy, instances, has a mother's power in forming the habits and character of her children been seen. When Solomon described the character of a virtuous mother, he says, "Her children arise up and call her blessed. Her husband also, and he praiseth her." But why so? Because they had not only experienced a mother's fond care, but had felt the forming influence of her example and counsels in their own character and happiness. Not to mention any other Scripture example, we may refer to the testimony of Paul, who, when writing to Timothy, thanked God for the "faith which dwelt in his mother Eunice and his grandmother Lois, and in him also." Now he did not mean to convey the idea that grace or faith was hereditary, but that there was a connection between the pious instructions, the consistent example, and the maternal influences of these women and the unfeigned faith that was in Timothy. "From a child," says the apostle, "thou hast known the holy Scriptures which are able to make thee wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus." Who held him on her lap, and taught him to read the word of God, and explained its meaning, and enforced its precepts, and told him of Jesus who had come to save? No doubt, his mother Eunice, who had first

been taught by his grandmother Lois. We repeat the sentiment; a mother's influence is greater in the formation of character than that of a father. Even when both parents have been pious, children have almost always traced their earliest and deepest religious impressions to the warnings, instructions, affectionate persuasions and gentle influences of their mothers. Nor has their distinguished and salutary influence been exclusively confined to religion. Few men have attained to exalted excellence as patriots or philanthropists, who have not acknowledged their indebtedness to maternal influence. Did it come within our design, we could show from history that the most distinguished patriots, statesmen and philanthropists, both of the old and new world, received their first impulses and aspirations after true greatness and goodness from their mothers. Many a son, recollecting a mother's influence in forming his character and shaping his fortune, has, in the language of a French poet, gratefully exclaimed,

"If aught of goodness or of grace  
Be mine, *hers* be the glory;  
She led me on in wisdom's path,  
And set the light before me."—*Pierre Vidal*.

In view of these interesting facts, there is no room to doubt what is the proper sphere of a mother. It is home. Her household is her commonwealth, her children are her subjects, and her husband is her privy counsellor. Although she takes no public part in state or church affairs, yet her private influence contributes effectually in forming good characters for both. No mother, who has either a scriptural or rational view of her relations and obligations,—who considers that the health of her children, their tempers, affections, principles and manners are committed to her custody, and that as she fashions them they will be likely to receive their form,—can wish the sphere of her duty enlarged. Instead of inquiring for other fields of labor, she will rather say, "Who is sufficient for these things?"

We beg the attention of our readers to the following sensible remarks, from a distinguished American lady, Miss Sedgwick, addressed to her own sex:

"I am far from wishing you to encroach on man's sphere. It has been well and truly said, that when a woman claims the rights of a man,

she surrenders her own rights. Unless she is wiser than Providence, she will gain nothing by the exchange. It is as evident that men and women are destined to different departments of duty, as that they have different physical powers; and is it not also evident that a harmony may arise from this very difference, like the fine accord of different instruments? I cannot believe it was ever intended that women should lead armies, harangue in halls of legislation, bustle up to the ballot boxes, or sit on judicial tribunals. But what then? The work that is done quietly and in seclusion is as important as that which is manifested by collision and noise. Without secret, underground processes, would the sap mount up into the tree, and give growth to the boughs that wave in the wind, and to the leaves that rustle in the breeze? By an unobtrusive and unseen process are the characters of men formed at home, by the first teacher. There the moral basis is fixed; she forms those habits of investigation, she trains the boy to that love of justice, that strict regard for truth, and that generous sympathy which will fit him for all his social duties. What, then, does it signify, if you are shut out from halls of legislation, and from political tumults, if the wisdom and justice manifested there are the result, in some good part, of woman's work?"

In conclusion, we would direct the attention of the reader to the encouragement there is for all mothers, without exception, to aim at the formation of a good character in their children. Perhaps there are some mothers lamenting the want of talents, of education, of accomplishments. These, although good in their place, and in certain positions in society, are not indispensable to constitute either good mothers or good daughters. Good sense, good temper and good principles, exhibited in the midst of one's children at home, inculcated upon them, and recommended by the example of her whom they love above all others, will exert a more practical influence in forming their character than the most brilliant talents, or all the learning of the schools.

Let mothers remember, it is not so much what they *say* as what they *do*, that produces the most powerful effect. Says the Abbe La Mennais, in a valuable work, just translated,

"Precepts are nothing without example. Whatever may be your counsels and exhortations, they will produce no effect, unless your conduct correspond. The moral character of your children will always tend toward assimilation with yours. They will incline to virtue or vice, according as you yourself are virtuous or vicious. How can you hope that they will be upright, compassionate, humane, if you are wanting in probity,—if you have no feeling for your brothers? How should they learn to repress their grosser appetites, if they see you given up to intemperance? How preserve their native innocence, if in their

presence you fear not to outrage modesty by indecent acts and obscene words? You are the living model upon which their flexible nature will form itself. On you it depends to make them men or brutes."

Do not, then, despondingly complain, "We have not the gift of speech, and can therefore do nothing for our children." It is not the gift of speech, but the grace of a consistent and amiable conduct, which tells most effectually on the character of your children. It is, "as the mother is,"—not as she converses,—"so is her daughter."

---

#### ARTICLE IX.

##### MACAULAY'S MISCELLANIES.

*Critical and Miscellaneous Essays.* By T. BABINGTON MACAULAY. Two vols., 12mo. pp. 456, 496. Boston. Weeks, Jordan & Co. 1840.

THESE handsome volumes contain sixteen articles, originally published in the *Edinburgh Review*. As they have appeared at successive intervals, they have attracted unusual attention, and have contributed, probably more than any other series of the same number, to the high and well-earned reputation of that distinguished organ of British criticism. We recognize among them many an article which instructed our minds and kindled our hearts in earlier days, and we are happy to see them now, united and within attractive covers, occupying a place in our library; for, though years have passed since we knew them first, yet the sight of them again re-awakens within us something of the glowing admiration, and re-kindles the aspirations, they at first produced. Though we do not feel ourselves called upon to review or even to read much of the miscellany which is now so frequently appearing, yet, from the first announcement of these volumes, we watched with interest for their publication; and now we cannot but yield to the allurements they present to linger awhile over the exquisite historical and literary pictures they contain.



With respect to the style and literary spirit which these works exhibit, we cannot be too strong in the expression of our high estimation of their worth. We place them among the very best specimens of pure and finished English with which we are acquainted. There is here no stretching of the language beyond its true capacities; no harsh and unnatural combination of words; no reckless defiance of established and classical usage. But, in the easy and harmonious flow of polished, though occasionally too elaborate, periods, we have the cherished views of a mature, a liberal and highly cultivated mind, that has pored long and deeply upon the histories and literatures of different countries and ages, while it has not been unmindful of the changes, both in taste and morals, that have marked its own times. The intellectual spirit, also, of these writings corresponds to their literary execution. The views which they present are liberal and philanthropic, and are every where distinguished for that plain, old-fashioned common sense, which is always so becoming to the English mind. We have no startling paradoxes, or enigmatical sayings; no new-fangled philosophy, such as we are constantly meeting in the productions of that singular but able writer, Mr. Thomas Carlyle. Indeed, the literary characters of these two writers, both of whose miscellanies are now before the public, bear a very striking contrast with each other. Mr. Carlyle has for many years been one of the leading interpreters of the literature and philosophy of Germany, to the reading public of Great Britain. Catching the metaphysical spirit of that most philosophizing of intellectual nations, he has come out a bold and fearless speculatist, both in politics and morals; while, in the domain of criticism, he professes to judge by new criteria, and to try by new tests, the performances of genius. His views are those of a gifted but inordinately speculative mind, that has looked at the world mainly through "the loopholes of retreat," and been but little engaged in actual commerce with men. Hence, his writings are characterized by a subtler and more metaphysical spirit, that searches with a keener glance into the hidden springs of human character, and traces—sometimes, indeed, in the light of a favorite theory—the under-currents of passion and interest, that run far down beneath the surface of society.

Mr. Macaulay, on the other hand, has passed the best years of his life amidst the labors and collisions of public business. After a short but brilliant parliamentary career, he became a member of council, in India; and, since his return to England, has been member of Parliament for Edinburgh, and now holds the office of Secretary of War in the cabinet of Lord Melbourne. His views, considering they are those of a scholar whose mind is filled with the ideals which literary studies always create, are eminently sound and practical. Disciplined by the classical education of an English university, and breathing the spirit of the common-sense philosophy which has so long characterized the literature of England, he stamps the impress of an elegant and well-balanced mind on any thing he writes, and puts forth views which commend themselves to the reader, not less by their clearness and soundness, than by the exquisite beauty of the diction in which they are expressed. He deals but slightly in the subtleties of metaphysics, and is seldom careful to reach the widest generalization, or the last analysis, provided he shows the practical workings of the principles he discusses, or the form and outline of the characters he delineates.

In politics, both these writers have long ranked among the ablest advocates of liberal opinions, though they must be considered as belonging to widely different political schools. That of Mr. Macaulay cherishes the sentiments of the old-fashioned English Whigs, attached to the monarchy, yet maintaining the rights of the people, as secured in the Magna Charta, and established by the revolution of 1688. The principles of this school are those which have been so often and so ably set forth in the political articles of the *Edinburgh Review*,—articles to many of which the student of political history turns, as among the ablest expositions of the British Constitution which the language contains. The school to which Mr. Carlyle belongs, advocates different principles, and aims at the accomplishment of different ends. Sympathizing in no small degree with the agitators and radicals, whom the inequalities of society in Great Britain must inevitably call into being, its leaders put forth a bolder spirit, and utter the language of a deeper discontent, not only with the measures of government, but even with the very institutions on which government depends. Their principles may be found

scattered over the pages of the London and Westminster Review, in which, indeed, many of Mr. Carlyle's miscellaneous writings were first given to the public. In soundness of political and of moral doctrines, in purity of taste, and classic finish of style,—we wish we could add, in influence upon the reading public,—we consider his writings as far surpassed by those of Mr. Macaulay. The reputation of Mr. Carlyle is probably widest, and his influence greatest, on this side of the Atlantic; while Mr. Macaulay is best appreciated and most admired among the cultivated circles of his own countrymen.

But we return to the volumes before us, and of them proceed to give some account; brief and imperfect it must be, if for no other reason, from the miscellaneous character of the articles they contain, and the variety of the topics they discuss. The first volume opens with the celebrated article upon the character and the poetry of Milton. We read it with admiration years ago, and, though we have often since turned back to it, our early admiration is awakened afresh, and we have now gone through it again. We at first were fascinated with the rich and delicate beauty of the style, the chaste and classic imagery, which is wrought so gracefully into every paragraph; but, as we have read history and studied human nature the more, we have been the more delighted, not only with the views it contains of the nature of poetry and the genius of the immortal bard whose character it portrays, but with the discriminating sketch it gives of the Puritans and their aims, and the splendid picture it presents of those evil times in which it was appointed to Milton to work out his noble destiny, as “a poet, a statesman, a philosopher, the glory of English literature, the champion and martyr of English liberty.”

Mr. Macaulay's views of the nature of poetry in general, or of the poetry of Milton in particular, can hardly be considered as peculiar to himself, though they are presented in a minuteness of detail, and with a power and vividness of illustration, which we think has never been equalled in any of the critiques upon the *Paradise Lost*, that have fallen in our way. He goes over the whole ground, and embodies in this single essay all the great principles of criticism that are to guide the labors of genius in perhaps its loftiest walk,—the composition of epic

poetry. The reader feels that he is receiving instruction from the lips of a master critic; and, though he may choose to dissent from some of the principles he lays down, yet he will seldom be unwilling to admit that they display a masterly knowledge of human nature, and a profound reflection on the modes of successfully addressing its varied tastes and affections, its complicated motives and purposes.

Mr. Macaulay is an advocate of the idea that the age of poetry lies in the infancy of society, and that, as civilization advances, poetry almost necessarily declines. In this, he seems to agree with Milton himself, who, as he thought of the high vocation of the poet, and the various gifts with which he must be endowed, doubted whether he had not been born "an age too late" for the accomplishment of his noble aspiration, to "leave something so written to after-times as they should not willingly let it die." But this is a belief which we cannot but be reluctant to admit. While it is undoubtedly true that the imagination of all men is most poetic in an early age, and that its domain is widest when the mysteries of universal nature have been least explained by science, we yet see little reason to believe that poetry necessarily declines as the human mind advances, or to apprehend that the day will ever come when the glorious song of the heaven-inspired bard will lose its power over the minds of men. Among the high gifts which God, from age to age, has bestowed upon mortals, we regard poetic genius as no more likely than any other to be withheld from future generations. Nay, more than this; trusting in the progress of humanity, we have been accustomed to picture to ourselves an age of still loftier poetry, whose character should be formed by the best influences of Christianity and true philosophy,—an age in which men shall have learned to survey with deeper sensibility the forms of outward nature, and the mysterious depths of the soul,—in which the imagination, baptized in the spirit of Christian truth, shall soar "with no middle flight," and gaze with undimmed eye upon scenes of beauty and sublimity, such as song has never yet described. The elements of poetry contained in the religion of the Bible are as yet but imperfectly known. The spirit-world it reveals has been seen in only a few of its phases, and the deep experience it awakens in the



human soul the muse has scarcely attempted to express. We can have no fears, then, that the domain of exact knowledge will ever be so widely extended as not to leave yet unknown a boundless realm for the imagination to traverse, and in which to gather the materials for song, which the eye of genius will not fail to detect throughout the universe of God. In another point, however, the opinion of our author is undoubtedly correct. It is true that the production of a great poem is a far more difficult work in a late than in an early stage of civilization. The poet of a cultivated and philosophic age finds his very cultivation and philosophy a hindrance to his art. He finds himself obliged to unlearn much of what science has taught him, to divest himself of the habits of thought and feeling which conventional education has created, and, in the spirit of a little child, with simplicity and wonder, to hearken to the voices of nature, and read the strange lessons of history. Besides possessing the requisite gifts of genius, he must break away from many of the established usages and opinions of his times, and go back to an age of simpler language and intenser feelings. He must be himself, not what learning and education, but what nature has made him; and, unmindful of systems and theories, he must heed alone the untaught suggestions of his native instincts. It is on this ground that Milton is to be regarded as having given even a more splendid proof of genius, by the production of a great epic poem in a cultivated instead of a rude age. He was familiar with all the learning of his own and other times, with the abstract principles of philosophy and science, as well as with the burning words and breathing thoughts of eloquence and poetry. We are to remember, too, that his lot was cast in an age of the sternest warfare of opinion, and that in that warfare he had borne a conspicuous part. He had appeared in the van of those noble spirits who contended for the great principles then at issue, and long and bravely had he battled for freedom and humanity. It was after this contest was over, when he had seen his cause defeated and his friends scattered or in exile, his hopes all clouded, and his domestic affections blighted and broken, in loneliness, and blindness, and sorrow, at a period of life when, in other men, youthful ardor has subsided, and images of beauty have faded from the heart,—it was in

circumstances like these, that he revived the aspirations of his better days and betook himself to the composition of the *Paradise Lost*. A work like this, achieved in circumstances so singularly adverse, is what history has recorded of no other mortal.

The character of Milton, as it is drawn in these pages, would seem to be Mr. Macaulay's ideal of a poet, a statesman and a man. He has evidently been accustomed to linger with reverential fondness over the varied scenes of his chequered life, to sympathize with the poet in every grief, to honor every expression of his noble sentiments, to mingle with him in the scenes of his study and his toil, and in imagination, to sit at his feet delighted to listen to the rapt strains of his immortal song. For ourselves, we cannot but respect this enthusiastic admiration. The abstract reasoner will tell us that these feelings lead the writer to present too bright a picture of the poet's character and life, and to exalt too highly his virtues and sacrifices. But will the abstract reasoner do better? Will he draw the same picture with greater or even with equal success? Will he carry us back to the age of the Cavaliers and the Roundheads, and place us among the men with whom Milton labored and those against whom he contended? Will he introduce us to the poet's private life, and lift the veil from the scenes of disappointment and domestic sorrow, of sickness, and blindness, and persecution, and neglect, among which he conceived the images of loveliness, and innocence, and joy, which fill the pages of the *Paradise Lost*? We are no men-worshippers. Yet when we go to gaze upon the portraits of the greatest and best men of our race, we are more than willing, we are happy, to find that they have been painted by artists who knew how to venerate their characters. We sympathize with an honest expression of heartfelt admiration for a noble name the more deeply, perhaps, from the fact that we so seldom have the opportunity. As we roam in the picture galleries of history we meet with only here and there a form whose lineaments appear to have awakened any thing like glowing admiration in the mind of the painter. How much more frequently is the canvass darkened by the frowning features of bigotry, or corruption, or selfish ambition, or meanness and avarice, than lighted up by the smile of philanthropy and truth or Christian

charity and faith. Even in the interesting historical sketches contained in these volumes, the character of Milton is almost the only one, that appears to have awakened the fervid admiration of the author. We see some of the proudest names in the history of science and of politics, made disgusting by petty follies, disgraced by private meannesses or associated with odious vices, until we almost begin to feel as if there were no exalted virtue and wisdom in the high places of the world, as if statesmen were all selfish, and men of genius and philosophers were all profligate and shameless. Hence it is, that as we have gone through this series of sketches, we turn fondly and reverently back to the character of Milton, conscious that as we read the pages in which it is delineated, and enter into the spirit of their author, we are, at the same time, quickening our own love of the amiable, the self-sacrificing and the good, and learning the better to emulate "the zeal with which he labored for the public good, the fortitude with which he endured every private calamity, the lofty disdain with which he looked down on temptations and dangers, the deadly hatred which he bore to bigots and tyrants, and the faith which he so sternly kept with his country and with his fame."

Mr. Macaulay, in his delineation of the character and aims of the Puritans, as they appeared in the age of Milton, is singularly graphic and powerful. We have never had the good fortune to meet with a more discriminating and vivid, and on the whole, a juster picture of these singular men than is contained in the following passages :

"The Puritans were men whose minds had derived a peculiar character from the daily contemplation of superior beings and eternal interests. Not content with acknowledging, in general terms, an overruling Providence, they habitually ascribed every event to the will of the Great Being, for whose power nothing was too vast, for whose inspection nothing was too minute. To know him, to serve him, to enjoy him, was to them the great end of existence. They rejected with contempt the ceremonious homage which other sects substituted for the pure worship of the soul. Instead of catching occasional glimpses of the Deity through an obscuring veil, they aspired to gaze full on the intolerable brightness, and to commune with him face to face. Hence originated their contempt for terrestrial distinctions. The difference between the greatest and meanest of mankind seemed to vanish, when compared with the boundless interval which separated the whole race from him on whom their own eyes were constantly fixed. They recognized no title to superiority but his favor ; and, confident of that favor, they de-



spised all the accomplishments and all the dignities of the world. If they were unacquainted with the works of philosophers and poets, they were deeply read in the oracles of God. If their names were not found in the registers of heralds, they felt assured that they were recorded in the Book of Life. If their steps were not accompanied by a splendid train of menials, legions of ministering angels had charge over them. Their palaces were houses not made with hands; their diadems crowns of glory which should never fade away! On the rich and the eloquent, on nobles and priests, they looked down with contempt: for they esteemed themselves rich in a more precious treasure, and eloquent in a more sublime language, nobles by the right of an earlier creation, and priests by the imposition of a mightier hand. The very meanest of them was a being to whose fate a mysterious and terrible importance belonged,—on whose slightest action the spirits of light and darkness looked with anxious interest,—who had been destined, before heaven and earth were created, to enjoy a felicity which should continue when heaven and earth should have passed away. Events which short-sighted politicians ascribed to earthly causes had been ordained on his account. For his sake empires had risen, and flourished, and decayed. For his sake the Almighty had proclaimed his will by the pen of the evangelist, and the harp of the prophet. He had been rescued by no common deliverer from the grasp of no common foe. He had been ransomed by the sweat of no vulgar agony, by the blood of no earthly sacrifice. It was for him that the sun had been darkened, that the rocks had been rent, that the dead had arisen, that all nature had shuddered at the sufferings of her expiring God!

“Thus the Puritan was made up of two different men, the one all self-abasement, penitence, gratitude, passion; the other proud, calm, inflexible, sagacious. He prostrated himself in the dust before his Maker; but he set his foot on the neck of his king. In his devotional retirement, he prayed with convulsions, and groans, and tears. He was half maddened by glorious or terrible illusions. He heard the lyres of angels, or the tempting whispers of fiends. He caught a gleam of the Beatific Vision, or woke screaming from dreams of everlasting fire. Like Vane, he thought himself intrusted with the sceptre of the millennial year. Like Fleetwood, he cried in the bitterness of his soul that God had hid his face from him. But, when he took his seat in the council, or girt on his sword for war, these tempestuous workings of the soul had left no perceptible trace behind them. People, who saw nothing of the godly but their uncouth visages, and heard nothing from them but their groans and their whining hymns, might laugh at them. But those had little reason to laugh, who encountered them in the hall of debate, or in the field of battle. These fanatics brought to civil and military affairs a coolness of judgment, and an immutability of purpose, which some writers have thought inconsistent with their religious zeal, but which were in fact the necessary effects of it. The intensity of their feelings on one subject made them tranquil on every other. One overpowering sentiment had subjected to itself pity and hatred, ambition and fear. Death had lost its terrors, and pleasure its charms. They had their smiles and their tears, their raptures and their sorrows, but not for the things of this world. Enthusiasm had made them Stoics, and cleared their minds from every



vulgar passion and prejudice, and raised them above the influence of danger and corruption. It sometimes might lead them to pursue unwise ends, but never to choose unwise means. They went through the world like Sir Artegale's iron man Talus with his flail, crushing and trampling down oppressors, mingling with human beings, but having neither part nor lot in human infirmities; insensible to fatigue, to pleasure, and to pain; not to be pierced by any weapon, not to be withstood by any barrier."—Vol. I, pp. 64—66.

This is followed by a sketch of the opposite party, characterized by a spirit far more liberal, and treating them with far higher respect, than has usually been expressed for them by those who have been panegyrists of the Puritans. While he sets forth their narrow prejudices and bigoted attachment to the forms and insignia to which they had been accustomed, while he shows the decided inferiority of their moral and political virtues to those of the Puritans, he yet honors their chivalry and high-breeding, their unfailing gallantry and the amiable courtesies of their private life. He discovers "a freedom in their subserviency, a nobleness in their very degradation." He admits that they had many vices, but prefers to dwell upon their virtues,—their courtesy and generosity, their engaging manners and amiable tempers, their elegant tastes and cheerful hospitality. In all these, and in profound and polite learning, they were far before the Puritans. Yet they were wholly unfit for the crisis they had contributed to produce, and their gallant and graceful qualities were inefficient and powerless, in a contest with the stern virtues and unconquerable energies of their uncultivated adversaries. They have passed away and left scarcely an impression that can now be traced upon any of the great interests of subsequent ages, while to the Puritans, we of the present generation, look up as to the fathers of some of our noblest institutions, the authors of our choicest maxims of constitutional freedom, the discoverers of our sublimest principles of religious liberty.

Mr. Macaulay endows the character of Milton with all the noblest qualities that belonged to either the Cavaliers or the Puritans. The rare elements of which it was composed, he sets forth in the following well-known fine delineation :

"Milton did not strictly belong to any of the classes which we have described. He was not a Puritan. He was not a freethinker. He was not a Cavalier. In his character the noblest qualities of every

party were combined in harmonious union. From the Parliament and from the Court, from the conventicle and from the Gothic cloister, from the gloomy and sepulchral circles of the Roundheads, and from the Christmas revel to the hospitable Cavalier, his nature selected and drew to itself whatever was great and good, while it rejected all the base and pernicious ingredients by which those finer elements were defiled. Like the Puritans, he lived

“ ‘As ever in his great taskmaster's eye.’

Like them, he kept his mind continually fixed on an Almighty Judge and an eternal reward. And hence he acquired their contempt of external circumstances, their fortitude, their tranquillity, their inflexible resolution. But not the coolest skeptic or the most profane scoffer was more perfectly free from the contagion of their frantic delusions, their savage manners, their ludicrous jargon, their scorn of science, and their aversion to pleasure. Hating tyranny with a perfect hatred, he had nevertheless all the estimable and ornamental qualities, which were almost entirely monopolized by the party of the tyrant. There was none who had a stronger sense of the value of literature, a finer relish for every elegant amusement, or a more chivalrous delicacy of honor and love. Though his opinions were democratic, his tastes and his associations were such as harmonize best with monarchy and aristocracy. He was under the influence of all the feelings by which the gallant Cavaliers were misled. But of those feelings he was the master and not the slave. Like the hero of Homer, he enjoyed all the pleasures of fascination; but he was not fascinated. He listened to the song of the Syrens; yet he glided by without being seduced to their fatal shore. He tasted the cup of Circe; but he bore about him a sure antidote against the effects of its bewitching sweetness. The illusions which captivated his imagination never impaired his reasoning powers. The statesman was proof against the splendor, the solemnity, and the romance, which enchanted the poet. Any person who will contrast the sentiments expressed in his *Treatises on Prelacy*, with the exquisite lines on Ecclesiastical architecture and music in the *Penseroso*, which was published about the same time, will understand our meaning. This is an inconsistency which, more than any thing else, raises his character in our estimation; because it shows how many private tastes and feelings he sacrificed, in order to do what he considered his duty to mankind. It is the very struggle of the noble Othello. His heart relents; but his hand is firm. He does nought in hate, but all in honor. He kisses the beautiful deceiver before he destroys her.”—Vol. I, pp 68—70.

Such is the strain of eloquent eulogy in which our author brings to view the intellectual and moral characteristics of Milton's mind. To many it seems exaggerated,—a splendid picture of the imagination, never exactly realized in the character of Milton or that of any other man. It is doubtless the filling out of a conception, of which the facts of his life furnished only dim and imperfect outlines, to the admiring mind of the author. But we can

pardon one who admires with hearty enthusiasm the truly great and good, without stopping to inquire precisely what amount it becomes prudent men to bestow. If it be an error, it is a comparatively harmless one,—if it be a weakness, it is one of which a generous mind needs hardly be ashamed.

Passing over the intervening articles, we turn from our author's delineation of Milton, to his notice of John Bunyan,—a different, though in more respects than is ordinarily supposed, a kindred character; for, in the language of Mr. Macaulay, "though there were many clever men in England during the latter half of the seventeenth century, there were only two great creative minds. One of those minds produced the *Paradise Lost*, the other the *Pilgrim's Progress*." We are happy to see in these pages so high an estimation placed upon the genius of a man who, in addition to all the peculiarities of his moral experience, has always seemed to us, one of the most remarkable of the literary authors of his own or any other age. The essay of Mr. Macaulay was written as a critique upon Mr. Southey's *Life of Bunyan* and the edition of the *Pilgrim's Progress*, to which it was prefixed. Though to our minds, there are striking faults in this *Life*, yet we cannot but regard it as the best that has yet appeared. The view presented of the work in this essay is, on the whole, a favorable one, though our author in general manifests but little disposition to bestow any special approbation upon the labors of the Laureate, either in poetry or in prose.

The *Pilgrim's Progress* is preëminently the book of the people. Whether regarded as an allegory, shadowing forth the lessons of spiritual truth, or as a romance, describing scenes of strange adventure, whether revered as a record of religious experience, or despised as the offspring of enthusiasm, it still possesses an universal interest, and commends itself, with almost equal power, to persons of every age and every degree of intellectual cultivation. What mind does not retain, treasured up among the things it will never forget, the forms of Christian and the Evangelist, of Greatheart and Faithful, of Apollyon and Giant Despair, or the scenes of the Interpreter's house, and the land of Beulah and the Delectable mountains? And who is not familiar with every step of the

way, through the wicket gate, from the City of Destruction where Christian dwelt, to the swelling river and the Celestial City beyond, to which he made his eventful and perilous pilgrimage? We have it all in our mind's eye. There is no hero, either of history or romance, whose journeyings we can recal and trace out in the memory with any thing like the same distinctness. And yet the forms whose movements we follow with so intense an interest, are in reality only conceptions, and conceptions too, of mere abstract qualities of character, which the transcendent imagination of the author has changed into living beings and invested with a personality so distinct, so life-like and natural, that they enlist the interests and take hold of the sympathies of the veriest child, and live in his memory like the men of whom he reads in history, or those whom he meets in the intercourse of every day's life. "This," in the opinion of our author, "is the highest miracle of genius,—that things which are not, should be as though they were, that the imaginations of one mind should become the personal recollections of another." Yet this is the work, miracle though it be, which was achieved by John Bunyan, not a learned scholar from the halls of Oxford or Cambridge, not the heir of wealth or fame and the world's esteem; but a travelling tinker, an itinerant preacher,—in boyhood, a *blackguard* in the streets of Bedford,—in manhood, the persecuted tenant of Bedford jail. Such is the destiny of real genius wherever it is found. It overcomes obstacles insuperable to ordinary minds; it rises from ignorance, and poverty, and obscurity, and utters oracles which are translated into all languages and repeated through all ages.

The *Pilgrim's Progress* has been copied, and imitated, and illustrated in various ways, and almost without end. Mr. Southey informs us, that it has been twice "done into verse," that, by a change of names and the omission of all mention of Giant Pope, it has been adapted to the creed of the Roman Catholic church, and that it has been rendered into every language of Europe. While it is a book which, before all others, is likely to maintain an enduring sway over the minds of the people, it is also a specimen of imaginative literature, which the scholar or the critic cannot pass by without paying it the tribute of his heartfelt admiration. As an allegory, it forms a



class by itself, maintaining its interest and preserving the congruity of its characters, from beginning to end, far more perfectly than any other with which we are acquainted. It furnishes abundant evidence of the power and richness of the Saxon elements of our language, and is invaluable, as a treasury of those plain, homebred words, which the writer or the speaker must learn to use if he would ever address the popular mind with any real effect. "There is no book in our literature," says Mr. Macaulay, "on which we would so readily stake the fame of the old, unpolluted English language; no book which shows so well how rich that language is in its own proper wealth, and how little it has been improved by all that it has borrowed."

We have space but for the following extract from our author's essay, intended to illustrate the influence exerted upon the character of Bunyan by the peculiar spirit of the age in which his strange lot was cast.

"There are, we think, some characters and scenes in the *Pilgrim's Progress*, which can be fully comprehended and enjoyed only by persons familiar with the history of the times through which Bunyan lived. The character of Mr. Greatheart, the guide, is an example. His fighting is, of course, allegorical; but the allegory is not strictly preserved. He delivers a sermon on imputed righteousness to his companions; and, soon after, he gives battle to Giant Grim, who had taken upon him to back the lions. He expounds the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah to the household and guests of Gaius; and then sallies out to attack Slaygood, who was of the nature of flesh-eaters, in his den. These are inconsistencies; but they are inconsistencies which add, we think, to the interest of the narrative. We have not the least doubt that Bunyan had in view some stout old Greatheart of Naseby and Worcester, who prayed with his men before he drilled them; who knew the spiritual state of every dragoon in his troop; and who, with the praises of God in his mouth, and a two-edged sword in his hand, had turned to flight, on many fields of battle, the swearing, drunken bravoos of Rupert and Lunsford.

"Every age produces such men as By-ends. But the middle of the seventeenth century was eminently prolific of such men. Mr. Southey thinks that the satire was aimed at some particular individual; and this seems by no means improbable. At all events, Bunyan must have known many of those hypocrites who followed religion only when religion walked in silver slippers, when the sun shone, and when the people applauded. Indeed, he might have easily found all the kindred of By-ends among the public men of his time. He might have found among the peers, my Lord Turn-about, my Lord Time-server, and my Lord Fair-speech; in the House of Commons, Mr. Smooth-man, Mr. Anything, and Mr. Facing-both-ways; nor would 'the parson of the

parish, Mr. Two-tongues,' have been wanting. The town of Bedford probably contained more than one politician, who, after contriving to raise an estate by seeking the Lord during the reign of the saints, contrived to keep what he had got by persecuting the saints during the reign of the strumpets; and more than one priest who, during repeated changes in the discipline and doctrines of the church, had remained constant in nothing but his benefice.

"One of the most remarkable passages in the *Pilgrim's Progress*, is that in which the proceedings against Faithful are described. It is impossible to doubt that Bunyan intended to satirize the mode in which state trials were conducted under Charles the Second. The license given to the witnesses for the prosecution, the shameless partiality and ferocious insolence of the judge, the precipitancy and the blind rancor of the jury, remind us of those odious mummeries which, from the Restoration to the Revolution, were merely forms preliminary to hanging, drawing, and quartering. Lord Hategood performs the office of counsel for the prisoners as well as Scroggs himself could have performed it.

"'JUDGE. Thou runagate, heretic, and traitor, hast thou heard what these honest gentlemen have witnessed against thee?

"'FAITHFUL. May I speak a few words in my own defence?

"'JUDGE. Sirrah, sirrah! thou deservest to live no longer, but to be slain immediately upon the place; yet, that all men may see our gentleness to thee, let us hear what thou, vile runagate, hast to say.'

"No person who knows the state trials can be at a loss for parallel cases. Indeed, write what Bunyan would, the baseness and cruelty of the lawyers of those times 'sinned up to it still,' and even went beyond it. The imaginary trial of Faithful before a jury composed of personified vices, was just and merciful, when compared with the real trial of Lady Alice Lisle before that tribunal where all the vices sat in the person of Jefferies."—Vol. I, pp. 441—443.

We are reminded, in these passages, how despotic is the power of circumstances in the formation of character,—in the development and direction of intellectual power. The same truth is every where illustrated in the history of literary men. The dramas of Shakspeare are the product of his own genius, acted upon by the circumstances in which he was placed, the persons with whom he associated, in his tender and his maturer years, and by the events and spirit of the times in which he lived. The Faerie Queen is the embodying of that mingled spirit of chivalry and religion that had not ceased to fill the minds of the people, in the reign of England's Elizabeth. At any other period, the genius of Spenser would have been impelled in a different direction and would have found other patterns for his allegorical characters than Raleigh, Sydney, or the despotic Queen and her subservient courtiers. The vicar of Wakefield is a record of the

events and a transcript of the scenes that marked the early days of its simple-hearted author. An author's life is almost always an invaluable key to his works. How much light is thrown upon the writings of Sir Walter Scott by an acquaintance with his personal history. It is the scenes of his own Scotland, its hills and glens, its ivied castles and romantic ravines, that fill the pages of his noblest works. And it doubtless was the singular characters he had met along the path of his varied life, and the legends that had been preserved among the peasantry of his own neighborhood, that suggested many of his most striking conceptions, and furnished the material for his wildest romance. We have been accustomed to hear of the creative power of genius; but an observation of its workings and its dependence upon outward influences and outward material, serves but to remind us of the immeasurable distance at which the creative power of the loftiest human genius is removed from the power of Him who speaks and it is, who commands and it stands fast.

The article upon the Pilgrim's Progress from which our last extract is taken, closes the first volume of the *Miscellanies* before us. The second volume, with the exception of an article upon the Life of Dr. Johnson and the celebrated essay upon Lord Bacon (which indeed is hardly an exception), is made up of sketches of a series of eminent political men and the historical eras to which they belong. We have here, traced in the bold outlines of their political careers, the forms of Burleigh, and Hampden, and Mirabeau, of Sir Horace Walpole, and Lord Chatham, and many of the illustrious contemporaries with whom they were associated through the various changes of their public life. We think Mr. Macaulay's *forte* lies in the delineation of historical characters. He combines in himself many of those powers which in his own splendid sketch of what the historian should be, he has regarded as essential to the production of really valuable history. His mind seizes upon the great features of an age, and without the tediousness of minute narration, he reproduces before us the scenes in which moved and acted the characters he portrays. Yet as we have looked along the glittering line of the statesmen and political leaders, whose lives are recorded in these volumes, we almost instinctively ask, Were these the great men of their age? Were



such the spirits who, in their day, determined the decrees of senates, swayed the councils of cabinets, and controlled the destinies of empires? The great names of different periods are here grouped before us, yet among them all, the eye rests upon scarcely one that is not tarnished by gross public or private faults. To this remark, however, the name of John Hampden furnishes an illustrious exception. In a corrupt and revolutionary age, he remained pure and philanthropic. At one of those crises in human affairs, in which the interests of thousands and the fate of empires seem to hang suspended on the actions of a few master-spirits, Hampden proved himself worthy of the exigence in which he was placed,—true to the principles and the rights that were endangered. Through all the scenes of his chequered life he ever exhibited the same exalted character,—too high for detraction to reach,—too pure for suspicion to sully. He united in himself all the qualities which were needed to guide aright the spirit of the excited age upon which he was cast. He was a great general as well as a great statesman, and died upon the field of battle, leaving England long to miss “that sobriety, that self-command, that perfect soundness of judgment, that perfect rectitude of intention, to which the history of revolutions furnishes no parallels, or furnishes a parallel in Washington alone.” But, with this single exception, these pictures of public life serve but to make us more distrustful of human nature, when exposed to the temptations of exalted rank or official power. And while we remember that all are not such, we yet would learn from the examples that meet us on every side, the more highly to estimate those quiet scenes, where, unseduced by the flatteries of the multitude, and undazzled by the visions of political ambition, the vast majority of men are permitted to pass their probation, and discharge the high trusts of their existence.

We are no where more forcibly reminded of the perils of public life than in the sketch with which these volumes close, of the political career of Lord Bacon,—a name which, in philosophy, is wreathed with the proudest honors, while, in statesmanship, it is sullied by the meanest vices and the basest crimes. The article now before us is, perhaps, the ablest of the series. It presents, in strong and vivid colorings, the outlines of a character in which seem to have been united at once the noblest



and the meanest attributes of our nature,—the loftiest and most comprehensive of human intellects, the coldest and narrowest of human hearts. In philosophy, he is exhibited as toiling for the solid and permanent good of mankind,—promulgating principles of the truest wisdom and the sublimest virtue,—principles which gave a new impulse and almost a new direction to the mind of the civilized world, and which, to the end of time, are destined to bestow incalculable benefits upon every interest of society;—while, in private life, we find him pursuing the contemptible arts of an intriguing and selfish policy,—flattering the vanity of the great, and fawning at the feet of the powerful,—sacrificing the interests of friendship and the obligations of gratitude at the shrine of a petty ambition for court favor and court promotion. And, when advanced to public stations, and wearing the badges of the highest official dignities, we see him still carrying out the same wretched policy; as an advocate, putting to the rack an aged clergyman, to extort the confession of a guilt he had never incurred; as a judge, accepting bribes from the parties whose suits he was to decide; as a minister of state, abusing his privileges, and perverting his power; stooping to gratify the silliest caprices of a stupid monarch, and even kissing the feet of his high-spirited favorite. How impressive, yet how melancholy, are the contrarieties which such a character exhibits! In his writings, we commune with him as with a noble-hearted benefactor of mankind. In his retirement of speculation and study, we see him discarding the fascinating but delusive dreams of ancient philosophy, teaching lessons of the highest practical wisdom for every walk of life, and, by a path before untravelled, ascending to the sublimest elevations of truth and reason ever reached by the intellect of man. Yet, when he comes forth from this retirement, he wears a totally different character. He forgets his philosophy, or makes it available only for the accomplishment of ignoble ends. He lays aside his aspirations to benefit the world, and becomes, without remorse, the dupe and the instrument of the vilest tyranny. He loses sight of the splendid ideals that, in his hours of thought, must have floated in his fancy, and condescends to vie in the arts of intrigue with the basest courtiers and most time-serving politicians of his age. Such are the opposite exhibitions of greatness and littleness, of glory and shame,

which his life presents, at every period of its history; alike when, an untitled youth, he was dependent upon the friendship of the Earl of Essex,—a friendship of which he proved himself shamefully unworthy,—and when, upon the dizzy heights of political power, he wore the great seal, as Lord Chancellor of England, and, in the prouder empire of mind, he swayed the sceptre of intellectual Europe. In explanation of this strange contrariety, we quote the remarks of Mr. Macaulay. He says,

“The moral qualities of Bacon were not of a high order. We do not say that he was a bad man. He was not inhuman or tyrannical. He bore with meekness his high civil honors, and the far higher honors gained by his intellect. He was very seldom if ever provoked into treating any person with malignity and insolence. No man more readily held up the left cheek to those who had smitten the right. No man was more expert at the soft answer which turneth away wrath. He was never accused of intemperance in his pleasures. His even temper, his flowing courtesy, the general respectability of his demeanor, made a favorable impression on those who saw him in situations which do not severely try the principles. His faults were—we write it with pain—coldness of heart and meanness of spirit. He seems to have been incapable of feeling strong affection, of facing great dangers, of making great sacrifices. His aims were set on things below. Wealth, precedence, titles, patronage, the mace, the seals, the coronet, large houses, fair gardens, rich manors, massy services of plate, gay hangings, curious cabinets, had as great attractions for him as for any of the courtiers who dropped on their knees in the dirt when Elizabeth passed by, and then hastened home to write to the king of Scots, that her grace seemed to be breaking fast. For these objects he had stooped to every thing and endured every thing. For these he had sued in the humblest manner, and when unjustly and ungraciously repulsed, had thanked those who had repulsed him, and had begun to sue again. For these objects, as soon as he found that the smallest show of independence in Parliament was offensive to the queen, he had abased himself to the dust before her, and implored forgiveness, in terms better suited to a convicted thief than to a knight of the shire.”

Among the many instances recorded of Bacon, in which he showed his utter want of generous qualities of heart, to us, the most melancholy is his desertion and subsequent persecution of the Earl of Essex,—his earliest friend and best benefactor,—the liberal cherisher of his genius,—the zealous promoter of his interests and his fame. Essex had done all for Bacon that a generous man could do for his friend. He had cultivated his society, and admired and applauded his genius. He had sought for him, from the royal hand, the office of attorney general; and when this was refused, he had bestowed upon him a valuable estate,

from his own munificence, and had even ventured to urge his suit with the titled lady whom he aspired to marry. At length the tide of his own fortune begins to ebb, the brilliant and hitherto favorite courtier is received with a frown by the queen, and the glory of his splendid deeds fades away and is forgotten. He is brought to trial for his life, for maladministration in Ireland. At a crisis like this, when friendship, and gratitude, and honor, were calling upon Bacon, then basking in the favor of Elizabeth, to come forth and stand by the friend of his youth,—the patron of his obscurity,—and to sacrifice place, and royal favor, and, if necessary, even life itself in its cause, we find him not only doing none of these, but exerting the full power of his vast ingenuity, and his high standing at court, against the unfortunate Earl, and bearing a principal part in “ruining his fortunes, in shedding his blood, and in blackening his memory.” He appeared as counsel against the prisoner, and not only prosecuted the accusation up to the full limit of professional duty, but, according to the representation of Mr. Macaulay, employed “all his wit his rhetoric and his learning,” to depreciate every circumstance that might extenuate the crimes of his unfortunate friend, to kindle against him the fiercest indignation of the lords and the queen, and, even after his execution, to darken the lustre of his achievements, and heap his memory with reproach and contempt.

From such records of his life, it is delightful to turn to the contemplation of his philosophy. We would gladly forget his lowly actions in the study of his noble principles, and leave the scenes in which he pursued his sinister policy; for those in which he communed with nature, and wrote his immortal works. No scenes are more widely different than those of his studious retirement and his political career; no characters more opposite than Bacon the philosopher, and Bacon the man.

Both these characters are unfolded in the pages before us, with singular ability and interest. The rise of the new philosophy, its peculiar aims, its distinctive features, and its relations with the systems of antiquity, are all distinctly and eloquently set forth. To some, we doubt not, the doctrines of Plato, and, it may be, those of others of the ancient teachers of wisdom, will seem to be underrated. Yet, when we consider the practical benefits that



have resulted to all the outward interests of human life from the philosophy of Bacon, we cannot but join with Mr. Macaulay in applauding its aims and its achievements. He represents this philosophy as proposing to itself a different end from that of all former systems, and that end he designates, in Bacon's own language, "fruit,"—"the multiplication of human enjoyments and the alleviation of human sufferings" among all the ranks and conditions of men. How far the view of our author is correct, when he asserts that Bacon alone aimed at "fruit," as the end of philosophy, is a question we hope, at some future time, more fully to consider. It is evidently one of his favorite opinions; and he here sets it forth with the full power of that brilliant declamation of which he is so able a master. We have space at present only for the following passages, in which he contrasts the influence of the "philosophy of fruit" upon the advancement of the race, with that of the spiritual dreams of Plato and the stern teachings of the Stoics. They are admirable illustrations of his manner in the article now before us :

"Suppose that Justinian, when he closed the schools of Athens, had called on the last few sages who still haunted the Portico, and lingered round the ancient plane-trees, to show their title to public veneration: suppose that he had said, 'A thousand years have elapsed since, in this city, Socrates posed Protagoras and Hippias; during those thousand years a large proportion of the ablest men of every generation has been employed in constant efforts to bring to perfection the philosophy which you teach; that philosophy has been munificently patronized by the powerful; its professors have been held in the highest esteem by the public; it has drawn to itself almost all the sap and vigor of the human intellect, and what has it effected? What profitable truth has it taught us, which we should not equally have known without it? What has it enabled us to do, which we should not have been equally able to do without it?' Such questions, we suspect, would have puzzled Simplicius and Isidore. Ask a follower of Bacon what the new philosophy, as it was called in the time of Charles the Second, has effected for mankind, and his answer is ready: 'It has lengthened life; it has mitigated pain; it has extinguished diseases; it has increased the fertility of the soil; it has given new securities to the mariner; it has furnished new arms to the warrior; it has spanned great rivers and estuaries with bridges of form unknown to our fathers; it has guided the thunder-bolt innocuously from heaven to earth; it has lighted up the night with the splendor of day; it has extended the range of the human vision; it has multiplied the power of the human muscles; it has accelerated motion; it has annihilated distance; it has facilitated intercourse, correspondence, all friendly offices, all despatch of business; it has enabled man to descend to the depths of the sea, to soar



into the air, to penetrate securely into the noxious recesses of the earth, to traverse the land on cars which whirl along without horses, and the ocean in ships which sail against the wind. These are but a part of its fruits, and of its first fruits. For it is a philosophy which never rests, which has never attained it, which is never perfect. Its law is progress. A point which yesterday was invisible, is its goal to-day, and will be its starting-post to-morrow."—Vol. II, pp. 465, 466.

Again :

"We have sometimes thought that an amusing fiction might be written, in which a disciple of Epictetus and a disciple of Bacon should be introduced as fellow-travellers. They come to a village where the small-pox has just begun to rage ; and find houses shut up, intercourse suspended, the sick abandoned, mothers weeping in terror over their children. The Stoic assures the dismayed population that there is nothing bad in the small-pox, and that to a wise man diseases, deformity, death, the loss of friends, are not evils. The Baconian takes out a lancet and begins to vaccinate. They find a body of miners in great dismay. An explosion of noisome vapors has just killed many of those who were at work ; and the survivors are afraid to venture into the cavern. The Stoic assures them that such an accident is nothing but a mere ἀποπρόγμμενον. The Baconian, who has no such fine word at his command, contents himself with devising a safety-lamp. They find a shipwrecked merchant wringing his hands on the shore. His vessel with an inestimable cargo has just gone down, and he is reduced in a moment from opulence to beggary. The Stoic exhorts him not to seek happiness in things which lie without himself, and repeats the whole chapter of Epictetus, Πρὸς τοὺς τὴν ἀπορίαν δεδοικτάς. The Baconian constructs a diving-bell, goes down in it, and returns with the most precious effects from the wreck. It would be easy to multiply illustrations of the difference between the philosophy of thorns and the philosophy of fruit—the philosophy of words and the philosophy of works."—Vol. II, p. 468.

Such are specimens of the views which Mr. Macaulay presents of the relative merits of the different philosophies which have swayed the ancient and the modern world. That the end which Bacon proposed to himself is the only or even the highest end of philosophical inquiry we are by no means prepared to say. But we conceive that from the common-sense direction which he gave to the mind of the world, have resulted the greater part of the comforts and conveniences that mark the aspect of modern society. We look into antiquity, and behold every where among its civilized nations the most perfect forms of the fine arts rising amidst the most indifferent contrivances of mechanics and the most unskilful arrangements for utility. Side by side with the genius that reared the solemn temples, that carved the living statues and uttered the undying

eloquence and poetry of Greece, we behold philosophy directing the ancient mind to sublime but fruitless speculations, developing no practical truth, creating no useful science, expending infinite labor, but doing almost nothing to alleviate the common miseries of life, or advance the real interests of society. And as we turn to survey the aspect of our recent civilization, we recognize, in the multiplying conveniences that surround us, in the improvements of agriculture and the mechanic arts, in the development of the resources of nature, in the wonderful facilities of travel and commerce, in the institutions of popular education and universal philanthropy, so many triumphs of the "philosophy of fruit," and so many proofs of the debt which humanity owes to the genius of Bacon.

---

ARTICLE X.

LITERARY NOTICES.

1. *Mr. Young's Discourse on the Life and Character of President Kirkland.* pp. 104. Little & Brown. Boston. 1840.

THIS Discourse is calculated, in every way, to make a pleasing impression upon the mind of the reader. Whether we regard it as a history of the life and public services of an amiable and cultivated man, who for many years occupied a post of high importance to the interests of the community, or as a sketch of the ascending career which in the atmosphere of our free institutions talent is always invited to pursue, or in a still more pleasing character, as a tribute of the author's affectionate respect to the memory of one who, in early life, had been his "guide, philosopher and friend," we cannot but be deeply interested in the records it contains.

President Kirkland was the son of an humble and pious minister who devoted a large part of his life to a mission among the Oneida Indians in the western part of the State of New York. He was born in 1770, at Little Falls, on the banks of the Mohawk, in the neighborhood of the Indian town at which the mission of his father was established. He pursued his preparatory studies at Phillips' Academy in Andover, and was graduated at Harvard College in 1789. After passing a year in the capacity of assistant instructor in the academy at Andover, and for two subsequent years filling the office of tutor in logic and metaphysics at Cambridge, he accepted the call of the church on Church Green in Boston, and became their pastor, February 5, 1794. Of this church he continued the minister, till the summer of 1810, when he was called to

the office of President of Harvard University, which had then just been made vacant by the death of Dr. Webber. This station of honor and usefulness he continued to occupy for nearly eighteen years, imparting, more especially during the earlier years of his administration, new energy to the discipline and new attractiveness and efficiency to all the departments of instruction in the university. The period during which Dr. Kirkland presided over its interests is usually regarded as the most brilliant portion of its history, and much of the reputation which the college gained during this period is ascribed by his biographer to the influence exerted both within and without its walls by its courteous and amiable president. He retired from Cambridge in the autumn of 1828, and after spending a considerable period in a course of extensive foreign travel, he passed the evening of his days in the retirement of domestic life. He died in Boston on the 26th of April last, at the age of 69 years.

Mr. Young does not claim for President Kirkland a character either for great original powers or profound learning. He was rather a man of amiable disposition, of unassuming manners, of sound sense, and withal learning enough to be interesting and instructive in the circles of cultivated society, and to fill with dignity the presidency of a seminary which demands of its head rather the general superintendence of its interests than the instruction of its pupils in the principles of any particular science.

We present from the pages of Mr. Young a single passage at the close of the Discourse, in which he sums up the sketch he has before given of the virtues of his private and official character. Of the accuracy of this delineation we are not in a situation to judge.

"Death, which harmonizes the pictures of human character, found little in his to spiritualize or to soften. But if it has not enhanced the feeling of his excellences in the minds of those who felt their influence, it has enabled them to express that feeling without the semblance of flattery. It has left them free, not only to expatiate on those well-directed labors which facilitated the access of the young to the treasures of learning; and on the solemn and persuasive style of his pulpit services; but also to revert to that remarkable kindness of disposition which was the secret but active law of his moral being. His nature was not meliorated, nor even characterized, but wholly moulded of Christian love, to a degree of entireness of which there are few examples. He had no sense of injury but as something to be forgiven. The liberal allowance which he extended to all human frailties grew more active when they affected his own interests, and interfered with his own hopes; so that however he might reprobate evil at a distance, as soon as it came within his sphere, he desired only to overcome it by good. Envy, hatred and malice, were to him mere names,—like the figures of speech in a schoolboy's theme, or the giants in a fairy tale,—phantoms, which never touched him with a sense of reality. His guileless simplicity of heart was not preserved in learned seclusion, or by a constant watchfulness over the development of youthful powers (for he found time to mingle frequently in the blameless gayeties and stirring business of life), but by the happy constitution of his own nature, which passion could rarely disturb, and evil had no power to stain. His sys-

tem of education was animated by a portion of his own spirit; it was framed to enkindle and to quicken the best affections, and to render emulation itself subservient to the generous friendships which it promoted. His charity, in its comprehensiveness, resembled nothing less than the imagination of the greatest of our poets,—embracing every thing human; shedding its light upon the just and the unjust; detecting the soul of goodness in things evil, and stealing rigidity from virtue; bringing into gentle relief those truths which are of aspect the most benign, and those suggestions and hopes which are most full of consolation; and attaching itself, in all the various departments of life to individuals whose youth it had fostered, in whose merits its own images were multiplied, or whose errors and sorrows supplied the materials of its most quick and genial action. The hold which the Cambridge student had upon it could not be forfeited even ‘by slights, the worst of injuries;’ and when he who had presided there for eighteen years left the scene of his generous labors, it was to diffuse the serenity of a good conscience and the warmth of unchilled affections through a community filled with pupils, who were made proud as well as happy by his presence, and to whom his very countenance was a benediction.”

2. *Algic Researches; comprising Inquiries respecting the mental characteristics of the North American Indians.* First Series: Indian tales and legends. By H. R. SCHOOLCRAFT. New York.

Unless the title-page had conveyed the information, the reader might have been puzzled to know to what part of the world *Algic* researches referred. It is a word coined by our author, however, to represent a large family of Indian tribes; and its derivation,—which could not easily have been guessed at, and which rivals some of Lord Coke’s derivations in its profundity,—is from the two long words *Alleghany* and *Atlantic*, which, combined, form the short word *Algic*! The extent of application of the term may best be learned from our author’s own words. “The term *ALGIC*,” says he, “is introduced, in a generic sense, for all that family of tribes who, about A. D. 1600, were found spread out, with local exceptions, along the Atlantic, between Pamlico Sound and the Gulf of St. Lawrence, extending northwest to Hudson’s Bay, and west to the Mississippi.” (p. 13.) “The territory formerly occupied by the Algic nations comprehended by far the largest portion of the United States east of the Mississippi, together with a large area of the British possessions. They occupied the Atlantic coast as far south as the river Savannah in Georgia, if Shawnee tradition is entitled to respect, and as high north as the coast of Labrador, where the tribes of this stock are succeeded by the Esquimaux. It was into the limits of these people [*Algics*], that the Northmen, according to appearances, pushed their daring voyages previous to the discovery by Columbus; and it was also among these far-spreading and independent hordes that the earliest European colonies were planted.” (p. 15.) “It is proper to remark of the Algic tribes that they were marked by peculiarities and shades of language and customs deemed to be quite striking among themselves. They were separated by large areas of territory, differing considerably in their climate and productions. They had forgotten the



general points in their history, and each tribe and sub-tribe was prone to regard itself as independent of all others, if not the leading or parent tribe. Their languages exhibited diversities of sound, where there was none whatever in its syntax. Changes of accent and interchanges of consonants had almost entirely altered the aspect of words, and obscured their etymology. \* \* \* The identity of the stock is, however, to be readily traced amid these discrepancies. They are assimilated by peculiar traits of a common physical resemblance; by general coincidence of manners, customs and opinions; by the rude rites of a worship of spirits, every where the same; by a few points of general tradition; and by the peculiar and strongly marked features of a transpositive language, identified by its grammar, alike in its primitive words, and absolutely fixed in the number and mode of modification of its radical sounds." (p. 18.)

It is, then, of a family of human beings inhabiting such regions, having such distinctive marks, and such points of likeness, that these "*Researches*" treat. And the object of those researches is, as we are told by the author, "to publish the results of his observation on the mythology, distinctive opinions, and intellectual character of the aborigines. Materials exist for separate observations on their oral tales, fictitious and historical; their hieroglyphics, music and poetry; and the grammatical structure of the languages, their principles of combination, and the actual state of their vocabulary. The former topic has been selected as the commencement of the series." (p. 9.) The researches thus undertaken by Mr. Schoolcraft are of a most interesting character. They relate to the most important object of science to which study and attention can be directed;—the science of the human mind. If well and thoroughly executed, they promise to open to us a new chapter in this important field of inquiry; and a chapter of deep interest, inasmuch as it presents the subject to us under a totally different aspect, under totally different influences and circumstances to what we are accustomed to contemplate it. The circumstances connected with the publication of these Indian tales as the first series of the *Researches*, may best be stated in the editor's own words. "Language," says he, "constituted the initial point of inquiry, but it did not limit it. It was found necessary to examine the mythology of the tribes as a means of acquiring an insight into their mode of thinking and reasoning, the sources of their fears and hopes, and the probable origin of their opinions and institutions. This branch of inquiry connected itself in a manner which could not have been anticipated, with their mode of conveying instruction, moral, mechanical, and religious, to the young, through the intervention of traditionary fictitious tales and legends; and naturally, as the next effect of a barbarous people, to hieroglyphic signs to convey ideas and sounds. \* \* \* Nothing in the whole inquiry has afforded so ample a clew to their opinions and thoughts in all the great departments of life and nature, as their oral imaginative tales; and it has, therefore, been deemed proper to introduce copious specimens of these collections from a large number of the tribes." (p. 12.) The fact of such traditionary tales existing among the Indian tribes has only recently been known or suspected. Mr. Schoolcraft himself was the first to discover it about the year 1822, when first resident among them in his official capacity. He first observed the fact among the Ojibwa nation, inhabiting the

region about Lake Superior; and subsequent inquiry discovered the same fact among all the northwestern tribes whose traditions were investigated; and indeed in every case to which inquiry has been directed. In this respect, then, the classical reader and the student of the no less valuable and interesting remains and records of our Scandinavian ancestors will observe that the rude Indian tribes resemble all the other most celebrated families of mankind which, at later periods, rose to the highest point of civilization. It is true the efforts of the Indians were far less perfect and far less valuable, if we may judge from the specimens given, as being more puerile and less connected with actual historic fact than the lays of the Grecian bards, or the wild but deeply stirring strains of the scalds of Scandinavia. Still the same characteristic of *teaching by oral tradition* is present,—used by all as the most powerful and effectual means of instilling into the mind of youth what was held as most worthy of being taught and remembered.

We must now make a few remarks on the actual character of the specimens of Indian oral tradition here presented to us. These tales must not be read for *amusement*; they must be read for what they will teach us of the Indian mind and character, and habits of action and thought. In the latter respect they will teach us much; in the former they will be justly held by most as "*flat, stale, unprofitable*." There is little of *poetry* in any of them; they are mostly coarse, rude, abrupt. They have little value as moral pieces; little interest as works of imagination. Were they merely fictions of human action, they might be useful to any man of any state or faith, as being good and true examples of action under certain circumstances which must occur alike to man under civilized and barbarous life. There is, however, hardly a single instance in which supernatural agency of the most extravagant kind is not introduced, by which, and which alone, the end is gained. To the Indians, who believe in such agency, these may afford useful examples, sustaining exertion and effort, but to Christians they thus lose all power or use as examples. If we find a man in any strait, instead of human exertion used to overcome it, we find him changed into bird, beast, or fish, as the case may be, or possessing magic pipes, or bags, or arrows. Most of these supernatural agencies are introduced in a manner at once coarse and vulgar, often intensely disgusting. The legends of Manabozho exhibit the grossest absurdity and contrariety of powers and means, and with no reference whatever, in most cases, to any moral justice.

We trust these remarks will not be misunderstood. We have spoken of these tales as *tales*, and as *repositories of information*; in the former view, in which many may take them up, they are pretty nearly worthless; in the latter they are extremely interesting and valuable, and it is in the latter view that they have been published. We had marked for quotation many passages from Mr. Schoolcraft's observations on the mythology, &c., of the Indians, as learned from these tales. Space prevents, however, our quoting them, and we must be content with referring the reader, really desirous of useful and interesting information, in whatever garb conveyed, to the volumes themselves, expressing our sincere hope that the editor may be induced speedily to complete the other parts of the "*Researches*" thus commenced.

3. <sup>(1)</sup> *A German-English and English-German Pocket Dictionary; denoting the meaning of all the words in general use, and likewise of the principal idiomatic phrases, &c.* By DAVID FOSDICK, JR. Two Parts. 16mo. pp. 369, 234. Boston. Perkins & Marvin. 1840.
- <sup>(2)</sup> *Kritisch-erklärendes Handwörterbuch der deutschen Sprache, u. s. w. von F. A. WEBER.* (Critical and Explanatory Dictionary of the German Language, including the Foreign Words which are used in ordinary intercourse, &c. By F. A. WEBER.) Stereotype Edition. 8vo. pp. 698. Liepsic. Tauchnitz. 1838.
- <sup>(3)</sup> *Allgemeines verdeutschendes und erklärendes Fremdwörterbuch, u. s. w. von Dr. J. C. A. HEYSE.* (A Universal Dictionary of the Foreign Words which occur in the German language, &c. By Dr. J. A. HEYSE.) Eighth Edition in two Parts. 8vo. pp. 570, 570. Hanover. 1838.

Though the German language is far from being such a heterogeneous compound as the English, and, in its native resources, bears a much more striking analogy to the Greek than to any other language commonly known among us, the literary character and the philological taste of the majority of German writers have introduced (unnecessarily to be sure) a surprising number of foreign words into the language. It is one question whether these words ought to be displaced by corresponding German terms, and quite another whether a dictionary for the language as it is should include them. In number <sup>(1)</sup>, foreign words have no place. "It has been my intent," says the author, "to give it (the Dictionary) ample completeness for general use, and at the same time to avoid overloading it with words of doubtful standing or of very narrow technical import, especially with such of the latter description as are of foreign origin and perhaps common to several modern languages." And how could one do otherwise in a pocket dictionary?

It is the object of number <sup>(2)</sup> to present to the general reader in logical order, and with simplicity and yet completeness, all the *results* of larger works both the earlier and the more recent. Thus the book is brought within a reasonable compass, and can be obtained at a moderate expense. Foreign words that may be regarded as *naturalized*, are properly comprehended in the author's plan.

Number <sup>(3)</sup> gives the whole body of words which the wide range of German scholarship and German intercourse with foreign nations have introduced from other languages. Here we find the spoils of all ages and of every tongue, the language of the university professor, of the artist, of the learned professions, of the sciences, of the Wiemar coterie and of the Leipsic Fair. Dr. Heyse was aided by the labors of many eminent men. The third edition contained an addition of nearly 3000 words, the fourth 5000, the first half of the fifth 2800, the first half of the sixth (by Dr. K. Heyse after the death of his father) about 1500, the seventh more than 6000. These statements will give the reader some general idea of the compass of the work.

Instead of arguing the claims of any one of these methods, we express it as our opinion that they are *all* good in their place. There must be pocket dictionaries, and a pocket dictionary must not be a quarto. There must be lexicons of larger and yet limited extent that



shall answer all the purposes of the general reader. If to the ordinary German lexicons can be added such a work as number (3), nearly all the purposes of an expensive thesaurus may be answered at a moderate cost.

We now pass from the plan of these books, to notice their execution. In regard to the first named work, we must here make a few general remarks. It is a great undertaking to make even a pocket dictionary of a foreign living language. Few persons have such an acquaintance with the various powers and the genius of a foreign language as to be able to form any independent judgment in regard to all the uses of a word. Hence the deficiencies of most of the dictionaries made from one modern language into another. Again, so limited is the use of such lexicons, that no strong inducement is held out for great enterprise and perseverance in combined and protracted efforts. The best dictionaries of a living language are invariably made in that language, and for the benefit of those who speak it. What French-English dictionary can compare with the dictionary of the Academy? Mr. Fosdick has succeeded quite as well as could be reasonably expected. He has used great economy in regard to the best way of occupying the little space which his plan allowed him and of crowding it with the most important matter. He has made as good a selection of words, perhaps, as a foreigner in his circumstances could well do. The etymology and grammatical principles of the language are, with some few exceptions, clearly exhibited. We could have wished a little more system in the order of his definitions. We often find a want of completeness in them (which must always be the case more or less with pocket dictionaries), and in several instances of accuracy in giving the true meaning which *usage* has affixed to words. But even where he has erred, it is chiefly owing to an excessive regard to etymology, a circumstance not the most unfavorable in the elementary study of the language. To sum up in a few words what we have to say, we regard it as a valuable dictionary for beginners, and as an improvement upon its predecessors of the same class.

The other two works are written in German, a circumstance which will make them repulsive to many, but which to the true German scholar will be their strongest attraction. According to our experience, a comprehensive and critical lexicon in the *German language* is indispensable to a mastery of that language. Another in our own language, will, of course, be needed as a matter of convenience. The work of Weber, having a very broad page with three columns on each, is quite extensive. It omits all quotations, and gives brief and precise definitions philosophically arranged. But while the vocabulary is very complete, the explanations are sometimes deficient in fulness. It is on this last account inferior to the compendious Dictionary of the German language drawn from Adelung, Campe, Eberhard, Heinsius and others, published in Reutlingen, 1835, in two volumes, 8vo.

Of Heyse's Dictionary of Foreign Words, &c., we must speak in terms of the highest commendation. It was for *words*, what the Conversations-Lexicon is for *things*. No German scholar who has once used it would part with it for any consideration.



4. *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera. Textum ex editionibus præstantissimis repitum recognovit, brevi adnotatione instruxit et in usum prælectionum academicarum edidit* CAROLUS JOSEPHUS HEFELE, theologiæ doctor ejusdemque in Acad. Tubing. Prof. Extr. pp. 260. 8vo. Tubingæ. 1839.

This little volume, as is intimated in the title-page, is designed as a text-book for theological students. It contains all the works of the apostolical fathers which have *any* claim to being regarded as genuine, viz., the epistle of Barnabas, the two epistles of Clement of Rome (the latter of which, of only eight pages, is acknowledged by all to be spurious), the seven epistles of Ignatius, the epistle of Polycarp, the anonymous epistle to Diognitus, and the Shepherd of Hermas. In the introduction, the question of their genuineness is discussed, at the bottom of each page are brief notes critical and explanatory, and at the end of the volume a very good index. Such an edition is not less adapted to ministers in general than to students. On account of its low price it is within the reach of all; and for ordinary reference it is more convenient than the larger edition of Cotelierius, while at the same time it presents a better text.

---

## ARTICLE XI.

### MISCELLANEOUS INTELLIGENCE.

*America.*—German Literature, translated from the German of Wolfgang Menzel, by C. C. Felton, in three volumes, a valuable work, deserving especially the attention of the German scholar, has just appeared from the press of Hilliard, Gray & Co., and forms the 7th, 8th and 9th volumes of *Specimens of Foreign Literature*.—Keightley's *History of Greece and Rome*, edited by J. T. Smith, and published the last year, are followed by two volumes in the same style, on England.—Mr. C. Wheler, instructor in Harvard University, has prepared a new edition of the *Prose Selections of Dalzell's Græca Majora* for the use of schools and colleges, with English notes.—The following works are in press and will soon be published: *Life and Writings of Samuel Adams*, by his grandson, Samuel Adams Wells, in five volumes.—*Life and Correspondence of Mrs. Adams, wife of President John Adams*, by her grandson, Charles Francis Adams.—*The History of Harvard University*, in two volumes, by President Quincy.—*Cranmer and his times*, by the author of *Luther and his times*.—*Paul Jones*, by Lieut. A. Slidell Makenzie.

*England.*—*New Books.* *Life of T. M'Crie, D. D.*, by his Son.—*Life of Thomas Burgess, Bishop of Salisbury*, by J. S. Harford.—*Ranke's History of the Popes of Rome*, translated by S. Austin, 3 vols. (a work of high merit.)—*Whewell's Philosophy of the Inductive Sciences*, 2 vols.

*Germany.*—A new volume of Gieseler's *Church History* has made its appearance.—We are pleased to see that selections from the great work edited by Pertz, *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, are made and prepared for the use of schools. The first volume contains *Einhard's Life of Charlemagne* (*Einhardi Vita Caroli Magni*, 8vo. Hannover, 1840); then follow *Liudprandi Opera* (*Leitprand's Works*), *Nithardus*, *Richerus*, *Widukindus*, &c.—The

first part of G. F. Grotfend's work relating to the geography and history of ancient Italy, is in press, extending to the time of the Roman dominion.—The celebrated historian, F. Förster, has published the first part of his *Life of Frederick the Great*.—Prof. F. C. Dahlmann has completed the first volume of his elaborate *History of Denmark*. This eminent historian is one of the seven professors ejected from Göttingen by the tyrant of Hanover.—The first number of a complete Hebrew, Chaldee and Rabbinic Lexicon, in quarto, has been published at Grimm.—Prof. K. O. Müller of Göttingen is gone upon an archæological tour to Naples and Greece.—Two new universities are about being opened in Belgium, the one at Antwerp, the other at Ghent.

In the year 1839, 500,000 books were imported from foreign countries into Russia.—There are published annually in Germany about 7,500, in France 5000, in England 1300, in Italy 1400, in the Netherlands 1000, in Russia 800, in Sweden 700, in Denmark 300, and in America 600 (?) new books or new editions of old ones. The rate of increase can be seen in the subjoined table collected and arranged chiefly from the *Conversations-Lexicon of the Present Times*.—*Germany*.—In 1814, 2529 books; 1820, 3958; 1830, 5920; 1831, 6389; 1832, 6929; 1833, 6312; 1834, 7202; 1835, 7146; 1836, 7529; 1837, 7891; 1838, 7850; (?) 1839, 8291. (?)—*France*. In 1817, 2126 books; 1824, 3436; 1829, 6416; 1830, 5363; 1831, 5684; 1832, 5756; 1833, 6068; 1839, 5322.—*England*.—In 1828, 842 books; 1829, 1064; 1830, 1142; 1831, 1105; 1832, 1152; 1833, 1180; 1834, 1212; 1835, 1243.—In Germany the largest number of works relates to theology, next largest to politics, and then follow belles-lettres, philology, history, medicine and law. In France works on belles-lettres and history are the most numerous, and those on theology the least. The largest proportion of reprints and consequently the smallest proportion of original productions is in the Netherlands and in the United States; the republications in the former being more than half of the whole number published, and in the latter more than a third.

#### QUARTERLY LIST.

##### DEATHS.

JOSEPH PICKLER, Davie Co., N. C., May 24, aged 65.  
WASHINGTON WINSOR, Stockton, Chaut. Co., N. Y., June 16.

##### ORDINATIONS.

BURTON B. CARPENTER, Dixon, Ill., April 28.  
JAMES HEPBURN, Clinton, Conn., June 24.  
MEREDITH W. COFFEY, McKaney's Creek, Adams Co., Ill., May 10.  
ALFRED A. CONSTANTINE, Mount Holly, Vt., July 1.  
CALEB BLOOD, Rehoboth, Mass., June 3.  
JOSEPH B. BROWN, Lonsdale, R. I., June 24.  
EDWIN B. BULLARD, Middletown, Vt., July 9.  
GEORGE D. FELTON, Westminster, Mass., June 18.  
DAVID FRENCH, Northern Indiana Association, June 8.  
DANIEL H. GILLETTE, Rahway, N. J., July 29.  
DAVID GODDARD, JR., Leominster, Mass., June 3.  
COLUMBUS GREEN, Colchester, Vt., June 11.  
A. ELY GREEN, Ashford, Conn., June 25.  
ELIJAH C. GREENFIELD, Walworth, N. Y., April 28.  
A. H. HOUSE, Coventry, Vt., June 23.

JOB KING, JR., Jackson, Wayne Co., Ohio, May 16.  
S. G. KINNE, Jefferson, N. H., June 25.  
EDWARD BRIGHT, JR., Utica, N. Y., June 3.  
RALPH V. LYON, Hampton, Conn., June 17.  
JOSEPH R. MORRIS, Mount Salem, Sussex Co., N. Y., June 17.  
DUDLEY ROBINSON, Friendship, Logan Co., Ky., May 17.  
R. M. SAWYER, Hanover, N. H., April 8.  
BENJAMIN TEMPLETON, Georgetown, Ohio, May 15.  
URIJAH UNDERWOOD, Spencer, Ms., June 10.  
JAMES VAUNES, Round Prairie, Ill., June 10.  
N. W. WARRINER, Cedar Lake, Ind., June 27.

##### CHURCHES CONSTITUTED.

At Marshall, Calhoun Co., Mich., April 8.  
At McKaney's Creek, Adams Co., Ill., May 19.  
At Minersville, Conn., May 15.  
At Londonville, Ohio, May 16.  
At Bennington, Licking Co., Ohio, May 16.  
At Trask's Ferry, Ill., May 28.  
At Spencerville, Penn., May 29.  
At Jackson, Tioga Co., Penn., May 29.  
At — Henry Co., Ill., May 30.  
At Marion, De Witt Co., Ill.  
At Glenville, Schenectady Co., N. Y., July 20.

##### DEDICATION.

In Branford, Ct. July 23.